A New Approach for Researching Victims: the 'Strength-Growth-Resilience' Framework

Abstract

This paper proposes a new framework for researching victims that blends appreciative inquiry methods used by prison researchers (Liebling, Elliott and Arnold 2001) with narrative interview methods used by desistance researchers (Maruna 2001) to investigate victim 'strength-growth-resilience'. Alongside established victimological concerns with the extent, distribution and treatment of crime victims, this framework offers an alternative lens that focuses on victim agency, identity and transformation. Building on the emancipatory project of feminist victimology (Davies 2017), narrative and cultural criminology (Presser 2016, Ferrell, Hayward and Young 2008) and an emerging narrative victimology (Pemberton et.al. 2019, Walklate et.al. 2019) the framework aims to provide a new conceptual reference point for victimological research. The article's objectives are to demonstrate that this framework delivers a theoretically, empirically and ethically robust approach for exploring the mechanisms by which victims become resilient, and can even flourish, in the aftermath of criminal harm.

Key words:
Resilience; appreciative inquiry; desistance; narrative; cultural victimology, identity.

Introduction: shifting the victimological gaze

This article proposes a new framework for understanding the mechanisms victims use to find resilience. We shall argue that victim resilience should be understood in terms of 'strength' and 'growth' and these are prerequisites for the capacity to flexibly adapt to harm and adversity. Resilience can be distinguished from recovery as it involves change – or growth – as a means for overcoming adversity, This change is often referred to as a 'bounce back factor' which can be understood as the common denominator in definitions of resilience (Walklate et al. 2013; 2014). We shall argue that not enough attention has been given to the ways in which victims use both internal and external 'strength' to overcome even the most severe criminal harm. Combining the biographical-

narrative methods of desistance research and the change methodology of appreciative inquiry provide the tools for understanding where victim resilience comes from, and the mechanisms by which they can grow, even thrive in the aftermath of harm and suffering.

If we take victimology to be a sub-discipline of criminology concerned with understanding the extent, distribution and impact of victimisation and the subsequent treatment of crime victims the focus is naturally drawn to harm, either at the hands of criminals – or the hands of the criminal justice system. This does not preclude more critical, radical and feminist discussions of hidden forms of victimisation, political manipulation or social injustice and there is a long lineage of victimological research that has investigated these dynamics since the 1980s (McGarry and Walklate 2015). Yet they all start with one form of harm or another. We do not wish to take issue with this starting point which is both natural and necessary for investigating victimisation. But we do wish to make explicit the axiom that harm has been the primary focus of victimology.

Why is this significant? Because by making explicit the inherent 'harm register' of victimology we begin to build the case for a new framework that investigates victim 'strength' and 'growth'. Our contention is that because of this intrinsic skewing of the victimological object of enquiry not enough attention has been given to post-victimisation growth and the *mechanisms* by which this growth is achieved. In making such a claim we are very mindful of three interrelated influences on our thinking. The first is the significant contribution of feminist scholars to exploring the dynamics of victimhood. In particular, the gender bias that is built into the lexicon of 'victim' and the use of 'survivor' narratives to overcome the connotation of the powerlessness, or even the blameworthiness of female victims (Davies 2017; Kelly 1988). The second is the emergence of cultural victimology and its emphasis on the politics, symbolism, and representation of crime victims (Mythen and McGowan 2017). We see our framework as part of this cultural victimology and it is intended to explore the (re)construction of self, and social identity as they relate to the dynamics of victim resilience. The third is a concern that our framework could be crudely (and wrongly) understood as trying to either

condone criminality or romanticise victimisation. A similar accusation has been levelled at cultural criminology (Hayward 2016) and we are keen to not fall foul of this trap. The next section will seek to explain the how the strength-growth-resilience framework can be operationalised and the intellectual progenitors on which it is built.

Explaining the Strength-Growth-Resilience Framework

How are we given, and how do we take, meaning from the harm caused to us? Can harm have unintended and unforeseen outcomes? Must these always be negative, or can they also be creative and affirming? These types of questions could be considered taboo as they seem to present criminal harm in positive terms. Yet they can provide vital clues about how people take meaning and survive the most harrowing experiences. How can this be done sensitively and without victim-blaming (Walklate 1989) or denial of the victim (Sykes and Matza 1957)? The answer to these questions is to combine the epistemology of cultural criminology with the methods of desistance and appreciative inquiry to understand the dynamics of victim resilience.

Consequently, our framework uses a narrative interview methodology framed by appreciative inquiry questions designed to understand the mechanisms that support victim resilience. Using the biographical-narrative[1] interview method from desistance research allows us to investigate the process of identity change victims go through over time. Similarly, appreciative inquiry provides a change-focused methodology that explicitly focuses on what made things better – for example, what constitutes a good day or a major turning point in a person's life? Both methods seek to identify the experiences, processes and moments in time that deliver positive change for a person. Combined, they provide the perfect balance between introspection and extrospection for understanding victim 'strength' and 'growth'.

[1] From hereon we shall mainly refer to narrative, rather than biographical methods as this is closer to what we propose. See for example, Maruna (2001), Presser (2016).

It is important to clarify that we are not assuming victimisation will always lead to positive personal growth. We are simply proposing a framework to investigate victim resilience, including its absence. However, one of the benefits of appreciative inquiry is that it also asks questions about what people think would have made a difference; or where they would like to 'get to' in the future. The appreciative inquiry methodology is explored in more detail in the next section, but our point is that our framework presumes nothing about the outcomes of victimisation.

This does raises questions about who our framework is intended for, and when is it appropriate to use? The framework is suitable for anyone who has suffered any interpersonal harm, regardless of whether they felt the victimisation represented a significant rupture in their lives. It includes crimes of both theft and violence and does not come with any presumption about the relationship between severity of the harm and impact on the individual and extends to include indirect victims in the family and wider community. All these groups can contribute to our understanding of strength-growth-resilience in terms of how they experienced harm and suffering. Very few people are automatically excluded from the framework though some exceptions might include people who have been harmed without realising it, or people where interpersonal harm is accidental rather than intentional as this changes the disposition of injustice and victimisation, (Green and Pemberton 2017). However, this framework is also entirely appropriate for understanding people who have been the victims of discrimination, political decision-making or environmental catastrophe – in fact anything that involves either the infliction of deliberate interpersonal harm or any non-deliberate harm that is not interpersonal (i.e. not directed by, or at, a specific person) as both describe types of harm that people often attribute a 'victim' status, be it burglary or flooding.

Regarding the appropriate point in time when the framework should be deployed, this is more difficult to define. The narrative interview methodology of desistance is obviously retrospective, requiring individuals to reflect on their lives and important points of change. Yet its value lies not solely in identifying past events to explain how and why victimisation happened but as with Maruna's (2001,

38) study of successful desisters, what it can also tell us about prospective change that is happening now 'in front of our eyes' and how meanings given to these are actively maintained as part of process of growth and transformation. Appreciative inquiry contains both past and future orientated questions but still requires victims to point to positive experiences or moments in time and therefore clearly also requires a period of time to have elapsed between the harmful event and the interview.

Exactly how long this time period should be is entirely reliant on whether the victim feels able to meaningfully engage with questions about how they have changed due to the harm caused to them. For some people this might be a matter of few weeks, for others a matter of a few years – or never. We therefore see no statute of limitations in terms of how long ago the victimisation occurred but can see that there is likely to be a point of premature intrusion, 'too soon' since the victimisation occurred. For those still in the throes of victimisation, unable to reflect and process its meaning, and for whom doing so could unnecessarily amplify current trauma there would be no empirical value or ethical justification for using our framework. We are very reticent to put a precise timeframe on this. It is subjective and variant, according to the type of harm, or type of person. But the first point at which victim resilience could be investigated using this framework would be no sooner than the point at which the victim feels able to say 'yes' to the question: 'Are you able to *look back* and describe the important moments that affected how you made sense of your victimisation?'

This question, and the approach we are proposing shares a common lineage with trauma-informed perspectives from cultural, psychological and therapeutic research and practice that explores the dynamics of memory, narrative, identity reconstruction and self-actualization (e.g. Antze and Lambek 1996; Brison 2002; Fassin and Rechtman 2009; Furedi 2004; Garapon and Denouveaux 2019; Gatti 2017; Herman 2015; Livingstone and Boyle 2018a; Livingstone and Boyle et.al 2018b; Rogers 1977; Skultans 1998). However, whilst these approaches start from a shared interest in narrative analysis, they tend to fall into one of two camps when discussing trauma: addressing either self-identity or social identity. This being said, our approach has been inspired by the Power-Threat-Meaning

framework (Livingstone and Boyle 2018a, Livingstone and Boyle et.al 2018b) that provides an alternative to psychiatric diagnosis (e.g. DSM-5) by engaging with social and cultural dynamics (alongside biological) to understand how meaning and agency function as protective mechanisms to people who have experienced suffering. The strength-growth-resilience framework is predicated on investigating the mechanisms of both self-identity and social identity that support victim resilience. It can therefore be described a psychosocial framework and shares much in common with the approach outlined by Gadd and Jefferson (2007) as it attempts to reconcile both the psychological and social aspects of victim identity and resilience. The research tool for achieving this is a narrative-appreciative interview intended to explore how victims reconstruct their self and social identity and how this helps them develop resilience to the harms inflicted upon them.

The ethos underpinning our framework is one of strength (or empowerment) and personal growth (or transformation). This extends to both the interview process and the focus of the framework due to the narrative-appreciative interview's capacity to draw out positive, life affirming experiences and moments of personal revelation and change (Bushe 2013). There are two important criminological progenitors that must be acknowledged in relation to this ethos. The first is radical feminist victimology that argued the concept of 'victim' is gendered and its meaning constructed through the power dynamics of a patriarchal society. As Walklate (2007) and Davies (2017) have discussed the word and status of 'victim' contain connotations of passivity, vulnerability and even blameworthiness that reinforces the subordination and inequality of women. Recognition of this issue generated the 'survivor' label that sought address these vulnerability and dependency connotations by returning autonomy and control back to female victims. Strongly associated with gender-based sexual and domestic violence (e.g. Gondolf and Fisher 1988; Hoff 1990; Kelly 1988) the use of survivor, rather than victim has also been a powerful catalyst for improving how victim services and the criminal justice system treat female victims of gender-based violence and how women and girls reclaim power over their lives. This in turn has spawned a new lexicon of survivorology (Karmen 2020) and victim-

survivor-thriver therapies that have popularised and extended the language of recovery and growth in the aftermath of gender-based violence.

Whilst there has been debate about the efficacy of a unitary feminist victimology (Walklate 2003) and, to some extent, about the unintended dangers of the 'survivor' label (Dunn 2004) our purpose is not to engage in a full-blooded review of the victim-survivor debate but to point to the shared project of empowerment our framework has in common with this existing body of research. However, in pointing to this shared project we must also acknowledge two important distinctions. The first is that our framework is not specific to the female victims of gender-based violence and the second is the fact that we continue to use the word 'victim' rather than 'survivor'. Our approach is intended to build on the earlier contribution of feminist scholars but is not specifically concerned with either gender-based violence or the feminist political project of female empowerment – though we would argue both are further supported through our strength-growth-resilience framework. A thornier issue that we have wrestled with is whether to adopt the 'survivor' badge instead of 'victim'. We have chosen not to for two reasons. Firstly, as discussed survivor has very strong associations with radical feminism and gender-based violence and this could be misleading or confusing with regards to what we are proposing. Secondly, and much more fundamentally, we are concerned that adopting the 'survivor' motif presupposes what victims might tell us themselves about their relationship to labels like victim and survivor. We see one of the key goals of our framework as investigating the relationship victims have with the labels used to describe them. Much like the focus of desistance research to understand the meaning and purpose ex-offenders attach to the 'ex' we want our framework to help understand the place labels have in resilience and the reconstruction of self-identity. In fact, the preliminary results from our pilot study using this framework have indeed found that the adoption, adaption or rejection of either or both the language of victim and survivor are highly significant in how some victims narrate the key moments when they found a new sense of self-identity and resilience.

This brings us to the second significant set of progenitors for our framework which are cultural, and narrative criminology. We think it is largely uncontroversial to say that cultural criminology is primarily concerned to explore the meaning and sense of identity given by social actors to their rule-breaking behaviour (Ferrell, Hayward and Young 2008). Cultural criminology contends that the meaning of transgressive and deviant acts changes in accordance with wider changes in cultural conditions. We contend that this also applies to the victims of crime and their sense of identity is shaped by the cultural meaning they give to their harm and suffering. It is this meaning-making that provides authorship, authenticity and control over experiences of harm. Cultural criminology often uses ethnographic or narrative methods to explore these dynamics (see for example, Ferrell 2006; Katz 1988) and the growth of both desistance research and restorative justice practices further signal what has been called the narrative turn (Green and Pemberton 2017, Presser 2016; Pemberton et al 2019b) Our framework proposes a narrative methodology that conceptualises the victim's story-telling as a form of resilience that can communicate not only important information about the mechanisms of change but also the ways in which the victim uses narrative to create meaning and purpose about how their victimisation has changed them. This narrative can be invested with biographical, political, social, economic and moral dimensions that provide an explanation for what has happened to them and, just as importantly, the motives of the criminal, the reaction of others and injustices at the hands of both. Narrative criminology has largely been concerned with criminal narratives (Pemberton et al. 2019a; Presser 2013) but there is now a small, but growing interest in the potential of narrative victimology (Green et al. 2020; Pemberton 2019b; Walklate et al. 2019).

These discussions of narrative victimology have in common a recognition of the growing cultural significance of victim voices and the capacity of these voices to improve understanding of victim identity, policy and practice. Of course, they also raise concerns about the over-privileging of some types of voices (Walklate and McGarry 2015, Walklate et al. 2019) or the misappropriation of victim narratives by the criminal justice system (Pemberton et al. 2019b). Whilst the misuse of victim narratives has the dangerous potential to become exploitative and misrepresentative there is also

significant potential to unlock new insights into victim identity and, in the case of our framework, victim resilience. By shifting the victimological gaze towards strength-growth-resilience and using narrative-appreciative interviews to explore the reconstruction of self-identity our framework provides a victimological companion to cultural and narrative criminology

Before moving on to look in more detail at the application in our framework of appreciative inquiry and desistance research we feel the need to exercise a note of caution. As Mythen and McGowan (2017) comment in their review of cultural victimology, one of the criticisms of cultural criminology has been the tendency to romanticise offending behaviour as a type of resistance to either cultural or political forces. A concomitant criticism could also be levelled against our strength-growth-resilience model insofar maybe it has the potential to romanticise victimisation, or perhaps minimise criminal harm. There is also a danger that 'resilience' becomes an insidious accusation that individual victims should simply 'learn to cope better'. To reiterate, our goal is not to minimise harm but to try and consider more fully its implications for how individuals and communities generate their sense of identity through the inclusion of some, and the exclusion of other, experiences of victimisation. The battles they fight. The victories and defeats they experience. The ways in which old relationships are broken and new ones formed. However, to prevent the possibility that our framework might be misconstrued we have explicitly sought a psychosocial balance to understand both the internal (narrative) and external (appreciative) mechanisms by which victim resilience is understood and realised. In doing so, we make no assumption that all victims will demonstrate resilience, or that the source of all resilience is intrinsic to the individual. Resilience has many faces and draws on many personal as well as professional resources (Walklate et al. 2013) and appreciative inquiry is explicitly intended to improve how organisations function by finding out what people find most helpful or beneficial. How this works will be explained in much more detail in the next section.

The Language of Appreciative Inquiry: driving change in victim services

Appreciative inquiry (AI) is a social research methodology used to identify what is good about an individual or an institution. It originates from Cooperrider and Srivastva's (1987) *Appreciative Inquiry in Organisational Life,* who argued that the problem-orientated approach to action research actually constrained its potential to affect change in corporations. Rather than these organisations or individuals being evaluated by identifying inadequacies and creating policy to rectify these problems, AI attempts to uncover their strengths. It is a developmental process rooted in the idea that our realities or social worlds are created by language, interactions and relationships. AI relies on the idea that in every society, organisation, family or group, something works, at least some of the time. So rather than improving things by solving problems, AI aims to affect positive change based on what is working. The idea is to unpack how successes are made possible and recreate then. An appreciative approach aims to discover what gives life to a system, what energises people and what they most care about, to produce both shared knowledge and motivation for action. The deliberately affirmative assumptions of AI about people, organisations and relationships are a contrast to more traditional forms of research that seek to analyse or diagnose problems (Ludema et al., 2001).

Whilst much of the AI literature describes its use as a 'mode of transformation' designed for organizational change (Cooperrider and Srivastva 1987; Elliott 1999), its methods are not prescriptive and guidance suggests that it can also be utilized as a 'mode of inquiry' orientated towards understanding when things have gone right or best moments. When utilized to its full extent AI consists of a '4-D cycle' with four phases (Elliott 1999). The *Discovery Phase* searches for the best of past or present processes; that is people are asked about when things have gone right and when they have valued colleagues' work. The *Dream Phase* encourages participants to connect their best experiences to an image of what the organisation could look like in a better future (Robinson et al. 2012). The third, *Design Phase* seeks to make the 'dream' a reality by looking to identify the positive core of the institution (Bushe 2011). The fourth, *Destiny Phase* refers to sustaining positive change within the organisation.

AI is of course, not without criticism. A key concern is the 'relentless positivism' of the approach, (which as Liebling and colleagues note could be seen as being 'too Pollyanna-ish' (1999: 77)), within an oft deployed concern and accusation of a refusal to face negativity. At best this could produce a partial image of reality and, at worst, it could actively ignore the views of the least powerful. The AI process however, starts from a position that accepts the construction of reality as articulated by the interviewee and supports that construction with empathy so that participants do not feel criticised or judged. For crime victims, this also reduces the likelihood they will be returned repeatedly to difficult or unpleasant moments by the interviewer (Isen 2000). AI does not claim to identify a single truth but seeks alternative truths through the expression and validation of feelings. Nor does it naively believe that all experiences are positive, but that by drawing upon 'the best', what is '*not* best' is inevitably collected (Cowburn and Lavis 2013). Negativity can therefore be explored by developing a sensitivity to multiple ways of seeing experiences and relations, encouraging consideration of opportunities, rather than dwelling on problems. Duncan and Ridley-Duff (2014) illustrate this in their use of AI with marginalised Pakistani women living in Sheffield. They worked through many difficulties and dilemmas of AI and so empowered the participants to develop critical thinking, particularly around issues of power and identity: 'Through generating authentic and untold stories, AI enabled participants to discuss, subvert and challenge the identities that had been constructed for them by sources of power within their community and culture.' (Duncan and Ridley-Duff 2014:117)

Within criminal justice and social and health care settings AI has been used by researchers in precisely these ways. Pioneering research by Alison Liebling and colleagues (1999, 2001, 2015), first applied AI in the pursuit of what constitutes 'good' staff/prisoner relationships within prison and then more latterly to explore and develop measures of the 'quality of life' in prison. 'Best practice' within service provision has also utilized an AI methodology within health care settings (see Carter 2006; Havens et al. 2006). Others have applied AI principles when seeking to explore the opinions of stakeholders in criminal justice settings. For example, female offenders views about drug courts (Fischer et al. 2007), the views of prisoners and prison staff about the impact of diversity on the high security estate

(Cowburn et al. 2010) and more recently in explorations of 'quality' in offender supervision from the perspectives of probation staff (Robinson et al. 2012). Such studies evidence a small, but growing body of research in the fields of criminology and criminal justice that is strongly influenced by appreciative methods. However, this is yet to be utilized and written about in in relation to the field of victimology.

The purpose of using an AI approach within our framework is not to deny the more painful elements of the social reality of victimization but to identify new dynamics that offer resources and experiences that go beyond an exclusive focus on what is lacking. In doing so, our theoretical framework seeks to shift this focus on 'deficits and deficiencies' to include and forefront 'accomplishments and achievements' (Elliott 1999). As noted by Liebling and colleagues (1999) this process opens an emotional space (Goffman 1963) that encourages hope as well as grief; positive as well as negative projections, to fill that emotional space in a healthy process of self-reflection.

Cooperrider et al. (2003: 88) give some examples of possible appreciative inquiry questions that frame and maintain the conversation in a positive position. For example:

- Describe a 'peak experience' or 'high point'
- Can you tell me about, in as much detail as you like, the day you remember as the best day in your life?
- What are you most proud of/what are the things that you value most about yourself?
- What three wishes do you have for the future?
- What strengths and resources might help you best achieve this?

The general principle for crafting AI questions involves evoking a real personal experience with a focus on narrative storytelling that helps the participant to identify and draw on their best learning from the past, which then allows them to envision the best possibilities for their future (Cooperrider et al. 2003). This is possible as Appreciative protocol is founded on the heliotropic principle, borrowed from biology and the amateur gardener, which notes that plants grow towards their source

of light. It believes that, in the same way, people and organisations move towards what gives them light. As such, they will be drawn towards positive images of the future and positive actions, based on the affirming, energising moments of their past and present (Cooperrider 1990, Postma 1998).

The Dual Ethics of Appreciative Inquiry

In developing the framework, a number of ethical questions can be posed, both at the functional level of talking to participants in appreciative terms and the ethics of conducting research intended to enable victims to think constructively about the harm inflicted upon them. As a mode of enquiry, AI draws on memories and emotion. It seeks alternative truths; the expression and validation of feelings and is focused on establishing a dialogue about how to achieve outcomes rather than expose flaws. In this way it has the potential to generate creativity. Ethically, AI aims to take better care of informants and participants in research. It seeks to be inclusive, to listen and empower, to facilitate change and to increase the delivery of fairness and respect in the future (Liebling et al. 2001). Thus, the sense of ownership of the project by research participants can extend beyond their specific contribution to include the outcomes and outputs of the research (Reed 2007). Such ownership is encouraged in an AI context and suggests a strategy for debating and resolving ethical issues.

Set against this is the possibility of re-traumatising crime victims by asking them to rehearse experience of harm. However, there is little empirical evidence that such concerns are warranted, and indeed research has shown the contrary; that victims have found the opportunity to talk about the trauma of their experience beneficial (van der Velden et al. 2013). Drawing on the experiences of researchers about the appropriateness of restorative justice conferencing for the survivors of sexual abuse, Koss (2014) found there was a decrease in post-traumatic stress symptoms for those who participated in the process. Additionally, Wager's (2013) scoping review of 10 survivors' experiences of participating in such conferencing found that several survivors reported that the experience was empowering rather than traumatising (Marsh and Wager 2015).

Whilst it is important to be aware of such ethical issues, AI also offers considerable opportunity for a 'generative' framework (Cooperrider and Srivastva 1987). Generativity occurs when people individually, or collectively discover, or create new things that they can use to change their future. In reviewing critiques of AI, Bushe (2013) suggests that positivity, particularly positive emotion, is not sufficient for transformational change, but that generativity is a key change lever. Generativity is at once the processes and capacities that help people see old things in new ways. This can be achieved through the creation of new phrases, images, metaphors and physical representations. These change how people think, so that new options for decisions or actions become compelling and available. When successfully deployed, AI fosters personal growth and resilience and by focusing on the future through the lens of strength and change.

AI is also attractive to policymakers and service providers as it is intended to improve services and most importantly has significant potential to deliver 'real world' benefits. In such cases, an appreciative stance can take the best of what is happening to further build on what is already in place and creates and maintains a momentum for change (Michael 2005). By working with the principles of what works well, what is valued and what matters most to people, victim service providers and policy makers are encouraged to adopt a facilitative and flexible approach that fosters participation, collaboration and experimentation. Helping people to explore what matters to them and reframe their thinking towards their hopes and possibilities enables a form of ownership and participation. So, instead of viewing victims as passive agents whom a service must be provided *for*, policymakers and victim service providers are able to work *with* agentic victims who have their own strength, growth and resilience.

Using AI to ask about skills, successes or strengths acknowledges achievements, taps into enthusiasm, and engenders feelings of hope after even the most harrowing situation. By explicitly drawing out strengths an appreciative approach provides voice for participants' positive achievements, survival strategies and success stories. As such, AI can make a powerful contribution to victim research by

looking at old things in new ways – ways that disrupt established patterns of thinking and interaction and move them in a positive direction, fostering kindness, resilience, better relationships and ultimately enhances personal agency. The act of asking a person appreciative questions is itself an intervention that influences both researcher and participant, as Hammond (1998) puts it: 'words create worlds'.

Desistance and Victimology: Turning over a new leaf in victim research

We have established the grounds for a new framework for researching victims and the need to move beyond the harmful event as the only opening point of reference in victimology. Where might we turn to find an appropriate investigative framework that enables us to explore further the full range of contingent and diverse meanings and subjectivities that victims give to their experiences? Part of the answer to this question is provided by what at first would appear to be an unlikely source of inspiration: research into desistance from crime.

On first inspection, the subjects of desistance and victimology would seem to be odd bedfellows, as their respective objects of enquiry are distinctly different from one another. Research into desistance from crime is concerned with "the phenomena by which those who were heavily engaged in offending reduce or curtail their level of engagement" (Calverley, 2013: 7). Admittedly, this is the behaviour and actions not of offending *per se* but those that instead contribute to the avoidance and absence of (further) offending. Victimology, on the other hand, takes those who are recipients of criminal actors' behaviour as its primary focus of interest. On first inspection, it would appear that they operate from very different investigatory reference points and have relatively little to learn from each other. This assumption that desistance research has little in common with victimology is misleading, as they share a number of areas of overlapping concern. Most notably, the impact of the close interactive and dynamic relationship between offending and victimisation has potential implications for our understanding of desistance. This is evident in the underlying theory and practices of restorative

justice whose goals are designed to bridge both the victim and offender/desister experience (Maruna 2017). The rationale for this is that greater participatory involvement by victims sharing their experiences of crime and its harms is intended to invoke salutary effects for the offender's conscience, prompting a re-evaluation of their past behaviour and redirection of their future behaviour away from crime.

Research evaluating the effects of restorative justice has identified the benefit of restorative justice in supporting desistance (Robinson and Shapland 2008; Shapland et al. 2007). Encouraged by victims in the restorative process offenders are provided with an opportunity to evaluate, reflect and plan the next few months of their lives which reinforces their desire to desist. Research has also found that the symbolic rituals of restorative justice conferencing produce feelings of trust and solidarity among participants that can be drawn upon to help support the offenders' desistance (Rossner 2011). Thus, the transformative potential of restorative justice and the weight it gives to examining the personal impact of the criminal event emphasises "the moral and social rehabilitation of the offender" (Claes and Shapland 2017: 302). This underlines our argument for extending the analytical focus through which we conceive and comprehend victims that, as Shapland and Hall put it in their discussion of victims within the court process "needs to go beyond being seen as an empty bundle of effects" (2010: 187).

It is also worth re-iterating that the strict dichotomy between offenders and victims is largely a false one. Offenders can be subjected to victimisation and victims can also be offenders. Those who are victims in one context may be involved in offending in another. Indeed, a number of studies (Fagan et al. 1987; Farrall and Maltby 2004; Lauritsen et al. 1991; Singer 1981) have "challenged the common assumption that offenders and victims constitute two distinct populations" (Farrall et.al. 2014: 218) while others have argued that victimisation may constitute a causal factor in offending behaviour (Farrall and Maltby 2003; Rumgay 2004; Van Dijk and Steinmetz 1983). Much less is known about the relationship between desistance and victimisation but the issue has been examined

by Stephen Farrall and colleagues (Farrall and Calverley, 2006; Farrall et. al, 2014) who initially identified that desisters and persisters experienced "similar amounts of total victimisation" and later that desisters "did not experience a statistically significant lower rate of victimisation than persisters" (Farall and Calverley: 2006: 158). Similar results for persisters and desisters were found during the follow-up sweep of interviews 7 years later, but when desisters were divided into groups of "recent" and "established" desisters the latter group were found to have "dramatically" significant lower rates of victimisation than their "persister" and "recent desister" counterparts. In fact, recent desisters were victimised more frequently than persisters, and there was evidence to suggest that their experiences of victimisation had propelled them towards desistance (Farrall et al. 2014). This highlights that not only are desisters not a homogeneous group but that the impact victimisation may have upon desistance and offending may vary and have different effects at different times and places over the course of an offending career.

The above discussion of victims and desistance research infers that the influential relationship is one way, with desistance research interests in victims unreciprocated by victimologists. As a result, the context is inevitably restricted to the primary concern of desistance: offending behaviour and the relevance of varied factors, in this case victimisation. Whilst prioritising their respective investigatory foci is entirely understandable it has meant cross-disciplinary shared interests in growth, strength and resilience have been overlooked. In particular, the potential to use insights from desistance research to critically appreciate the subjective meanings given to the relational context and social processes incurred by being a victim.

Desisting from crime and recovering from being a victim of crime share important conceptual commonalities. A consensus of research into desistance is it should not be understood as a single event. To view it solely through the prism of the last known 'criminal event' not only limits scope of inquiry but is illogical for how can 'the same moment when a person becomes an offender, he also becomes a desister' asks Maruna (2001: 23). Rather desistance is better understood as a process, not

an event; that typically unfolds gradually and progressively over time. It may not necessarily be linear, re-lapses are common and may mean some 'zig-zagging' back and forth to crime, but the broad direction of travel will be away from offending (Laub and Sampson 2001). At its most basic this journey involves a transition from being an established offender to being an established non-offender. Securing a better understanding of how this process happens has inevitably entailed desistance research examining the wider range of processes associated with supporting or impeding this journey.

The lesson herein for victims' research is that victimisation may be initiated by an event, but it is the journey that counts. It will, of course, be a very different journey but developing a conceptual framework for better understanding victims demands that we learn the lessons of desistance research and previous victim scholarship into harm and recovery: shift the focus of analytical enquiry away from conceiving victimisation being defined solely by the criminal event and view it as a process.

Exploring victim identities: insights from desistance research

Having traditionally been an under-researched and overlooked aspect of criminological study, interest in how and why individuals stop offending has increased substantially over the last three decades. While there is not space to provide a full review of the literature here (see Farrall et al. 2014; Laub and Sampson 2001; Farrall and Calverley 2006; Roque, 2017), it is worth highlighting that one of the principal findings of desistance is a combination of both individualistic and sociogenic processes. This may also be relevant to understanding victims' journey away from crime and raises the question, if desistance provides an alternative conceptual lens through which to better study victims' experiences, how might it be most usefully applied? The following may be potentially fruitful areas of enquiry. First, are the structural and agentic factors associated with desistance also recognisable within victims' accounts of their post-crime lives? Second, and relatedly, what role do these factors play in shaping the subjective meanings that victims employ as part of the process of making sense of their experience? Third, is the concept of identity transition in desistance (Robinson and Hamilton

2016) also relevant to victims' journey of recovery? We would argue that there is much to be gained from the insights of desistance research through exploring further the ways and means through which victims' construct and manage their identities.

Research has identified a range of 'external' structural factors associated with stopping offending. These include finding a 'good job', establishing new relationship with a significant 'other' such as partner or becoming a parent (Farrall 2002), life transitions such as moving away from home and break up of peer group (Warr 1998), engagement with other social institutions such as education, military service or the criminal justice system (Laub and Sampson 2003). They can be viewed as 'external' in that they are embedded within wider social structures and cultural practices that comprise the social contexts in which would-be desisters reside (Farrall et al. 2011; Calverley 2013). These findings beg us to consider the immediate and wider social contexts that victims inhabit, and what 'external' mechanisms affect it. Given what we know about the importance of social relationships in simultaneously providing the means through which desistance takes place and the motivation to initiate and maintain decision to do so (Weaver 2016), what role do victims' social relationships such as family, peers, employment play in process of 'moving on' or coming to terms with their experiences of victimisation? Moreover, and dovetailing with the aims and values inherent in appreciative inquiry, are some mechanisms better than others at supporting victims and enabling them to overcome their victimisation? Do they enable the accumulation of 'social capital' and does this support victims' efficacy the same way that it has been identified for offenders who are trying to desist (Farrall, 2004; Laub and Sampson 2003).

Do some victims frame their experience in positive terms? In a similar fashion to desisters, do victims experience increased generativity and desire to use their past experience to help others (Maruna 2001) and can this lead to greater involvement in citizenship activities and engagement with civic institutions (Uggen 2003)? Ward and Maruna (2007) argue that successful offender rehabilitation is supported through the enhancement of offenders' well-being via a strengths-based approach that

encourages them to live better lives. Although Ward and Maruna (2007) have argued their model should not apply to crime victims, stating that to do so could lead to victim-blaming (and we agree) there is much in common between the Good Lives Model and our strength-growth-resilience framework's shared emphasis on human flourishing. In common with AI, identifying what helps to live good lives will assist in developing a model that can be used by practitioners with interest in reducing harm and aiding victim recovery. Viewing victim identity in isolation from other forms of identity overlooks the potential role played by these other forms of identity in influencing and informing how victim identity is constructed.

As well as being a social process, desistance is also associated with an array of processes that take place within the 'internal' world of the desister. Desistance is not fixed or determined. It is dependent on agency and characterised by precariousness and uncertainty. Theorists have argued (;Maruna and Farrall 2004; Paternoster and Bushway, 2009; Vaughan, 2007) and research has found (Bottoms and Shapland 2011; Healy 2012; Maruna 2001) desistance to frequently involve a (series of) 'cognitive transformation(s)' wherein those who have been engaged in offending reassess how they view their offending behaviour, themselves and their lives.

The strength-growth-resilience framework is designed to investigate whether victims undergo a similar transformation in terms of their self and social identities. As with desistance, do victims undergo an existential reconstruction of who they are, and the meanings they give to significant events and others in their lives (Farrall 2005)? For example, desistance research has stressed the important role that hope can play as a resource that provides the motivation and means to envision a crime-free future (Burnett and Maruna 2004; Farall and Calverley 2006). Is 'hope' similarly relevant for the victims' journey from crime? Feminist victimology points to hope in terms of hashtag feminist campaigns and 'survival' narratives aimed at unshackling women and girls from the experience and stigma of sexual and domestic violence (e.g. (Clark 2016; Delker et al. 2020; Pemberton and Loeb 2020). This research demonstrates that at both the political and personal level, emotions – and hope

in particular - are clearly present in the process of change and growth to 'survivor' status. As with desistance, different emotions are likely to be reported at different stages of this journey (Farall and Calverley, 2006; Farrall et al, 2014) but within the context of gender-based victimisation it is clear that victims make sense of their pasts to inform their current identity. In this sense, victims re-biograph their life stories to ensure a coherent self-identity like successful desisters (Maruna 2001).

Having established that desistance research has much to inform our quest for a deeper understanding of victims, we would also argue that we should borrow from its research methodology if we are to develop an appropriate toolkit for our strength-growth-resilience framework. Narrative accounts have been a recurring feature of desistance literature (Giordano et al. 2002; Healy 2012; Laub and Sampson 2003; Calverley 2013) and narrative interview methods (McAdams 1985) have been explicitly used in the work of Shadd Maruna (1999, 2001). The underlying principle behind this approach is that the best way to access subjective meanings and interpretations that individuals give to their lives and life events is to allow them to tell their own stories. This has a number of advantages for researching victims. Foremost, it enables insight into how they construct and re-organise their self-identity in relation to the past, present and how they see their future. This is useful for exploring issues of identity and well-being and personal growth. For instance Bauer, McAdams and Pals (2008) identified that self-narrative of interviewees with "high levels of eudaimonic well-being" which refers Aristotelian view of happiness emanating from pleasure in the 'good life' and "how one thinks about oneself and other" (ibid, 84). This allowed them to frame difficult experiences as transformative wherein they suffered deep pain but gained new insights about themselves" (ibid, 81). This methodology enable exploration of victim's well-being and response to the 'disorienting episode' (Loftland 1969) of their victimisation. Secondly, as Maruna (2001: 39) argues "self-narratives are used to guide and organise human behavior patterns… are dynamic… [and] are explicitly contextual". As with offenders we can better understand victims as a group by "analyzing the stories that members of that group are telling". Thirdly, and more practically, the method engenders a sympathetic and supportive listening environment, where interviewees feel they are listened to and respected; which helps build rapport

(Bauer, 1996). In sum, narrative interview methods promise to answer McGarry and Walklate's (2015) appeal that voices of those who have been harmed are listened to by placing their self-narration centre stage and, literally, giving voice to victim's experiences.

Conclusion

We have proposed a narrative-appreciative methodology to investigate victim strength-growth-resilience. This new framework is intended to acknowledge victim agency and as a continuation of the empowerment project that underpins feminist victimology. Our contention is that if victimology starts from the position of investigating problems and harms, it inadvertently frames the victim as helpless, problematic and has the capacity to reinforce stigmatisation. This in turn shapes victim identities as passive and blameworthy and can reduce their ability to envision a greater future, effectively robbing them of self-efficacy for positive change, even transformation. When victim research starts from a harm-orientated perspective it often fails to capture the energy, complexity and agency involved in how individuals and communities generate their own sense of identity through some experiences of victimisation and not others. By contrast, our new framework seeks to foreground and appreciate mechanisms of strength and growth as well as, not instead of, the harm caused by crime. Additionally, it also provides a more sensitive and affirming approach that promotes greater understanding of the relationship between victim identity and resilience. Fundamentally, our strength-growth-resilience framework engages with the subjective experience and meaning of being a victim. Furthermore, it also provides a new epistemology that acknowledges the agency victims have in deciding how they respond to the harm and injustice inflicted upon them. And is part of a nascent 'cultural victimology' that awakens and examines the meaning people give to their lives as a result of the harm they have experienced (Green and Pemberton 2017; McGarry and Walklate 2015; Walklate 2012).

Funding

This work was supported by the British Academy and Leverhulme Trust [SG161060] who funded the project: 'Giving voice' to Victims: a strengths-based investigation into victim identities'; and the COST Association [CA18121] that funds the research network we are part of called: Cultures of Victimology: understanding processes of victimization across Europe.

Acknowledgements

We would also like to thank Professor Sandra Walklate and Professor Antony Pemberton who both helped at various points by commenting on the grant applications and ideas that went into the development of this article.

References

Antze, P. and Lambek, M., eds. (1996), *Tense Past: Cultural Essays in Trauma and Memory*. London: Routledge.

Bauer, J., McAdams, D. and Pals, J. (2008), Narrative Identity and Eudaimonic Well-being, *Journal of Happiness Studies*, Volume 9: 81-104.

Bottoms, A.E. and Shapland, J. (2011), Steps Towards Desistance Among Male Young Adult Recidivists. In S. Farrall, M. Hough, S. Maruna and R. Sparks, eds., *Escape Routes (pp. 43-80).* London: Routledge.

Brison, S. (2002), *Aftermath: Violence and the Remaking of a Self*. Princeton, N: Princeton University Press.

Bushe, G.R. (2011), 'Appreciative Inquiry: Theory and Critique', in D. Boje, B. Burnes and J. Hassard, eds., *The Routledge Companion to Organisational Change.* Oxford: Routledge.

Bushe, G.R. (2013), Generative Process, Generative Outcome: The Transformational Potential of Appreciative Inquiry, in D.L. Cooperrider et al., eds., *Organizational generativity: The*

appreciative inquiry summit and a scholarship of transformation (Advances in Appreciative Inquiry, Volume 4), Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 89–113.

Calverley, A. (2013), *Cultures of Desistance: Rehabilitation, Reintegration and Ethnic Minorities*, Abingdon: Routledge

Carter, B. (2006), One Expertise Among Many' – Working Appreciatively to Make Miracles Instead of Finding Problems: Using Appreciative Inquiry as a Way of Reframing Research, *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 11: 48-63.

Claes, B. and Shapland, J. (2016), Desistance from Crime and Restorative Justice, *Restorative Justice*, 4:3, 302-322, DOI: 10.1080/20504721.2016.1245912.

Clark, R. (2016), "Hope in a Hashtag": the Discursive Activism of #WhyIStayed, *Feminist Media Studies*, 16:5, 788-804, DOI: 10.1080/14680777.2016.1138235.

Cooperrider, D.L., (01990), *Appreciative Management and Leadership: The Power of Positive Thought and Action in Organizations*. Jossey-Bass.

Cooperrider, D. L., and Srivastva, S. (1987), Appreciative Inquiry in Organizational Life. In W. A. Pasmore and R. W. Woodmands, eds., *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, Vol. 1 (129-169). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Cooperrider, D., Whitney, D., and Stavros, J. (2003), *Appreciative Inquiry Handbook: The First in a Series of appreciative inquiry Workbooks for Leaders of Change*. Bedford Heights, OH: Lakeshore Publishers.

Cowburn, M., Lavis, V. and Bird, H. (2010), *Appreciative Inquiry into the Diversity Strategy of HMP Wakefield*. Unpublished report to ESRC. Available at http://www.esrc.ac.uk/my-esrc/Grants/RES-000-22-3441/read.

Cowburn, M. and Lavis, V. (2013), 'Using a Prisoner Advisory Group to Develop Diversity Research in a Maximum-Security Prison: A Means of Enhancing Prisoner Participation', *Groupwork*, 23(3) 67-79.

Davies, P. (2017), Feminist voices, gender and victimisation. In S. Walklate, ed., *Handbook of Victims and Victimology (pp. 107-123)* (2nd ed.), London: Routledge.

Delker, B.C., Salton. R. and McLean, K.C. (2020), Giving Voice to Silence: Empowerment and Disempowerment in the Developmental Shift from Trauma 'Victim' to 'Survivor-Advocate', *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation*, 21:2, 242-263, DOI: 10.1080/15299732.2019.1678212

Duncan, G. and Ridley-Duff, R.J. (2014), Appreciative Inquiry as a Method of Transforming Identity and Power in Pakistani Women, *Action Research*, 12 (2), June.

Dunn, J.L. (2004), "Victims" and "Survivors": Emerging Vocabularies of Motive for "Battered women Who Stay". *Sociological Inquiry*, 75(1) 1 – 30.

Elliott, C. (1999), *Locating the Energy for Change: An introduction to Appreciative Inquiry*, Winnipeg: International Institute for Sustainable Development.

Fagan, J., Piper, E. S., and Cheng, Y. T. (1987), Contributions of Victimization to Delinquency in Inner Cities. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* (1973), 78(3): 586–61.

Farrall, S. (2004), Social Capital and Offender Reintegration: Making Probation Desistance Focussed. In S. Maruna, and R. Immarigeon, eds., *After Crime and Punishment: Ex-Offender Reintegration and Desistance From Crime*, 57-82, Cullompton, Devon: Willan Publishing.

Farrall, S. (2005), On The Existential Aspects of Desistance from Crime. *Symbolic Interaction*, 28(3): 367-86.

Farrall, S. and Calverley, A. (2006), *Understanding Desistance from Crime*, London: Open University Press.

Farrall, S. and Maltby, S. (2003), The Victimisation of Probationers. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 42 (1): 32-54.

Farrall, S., Sharpe, G. Hunter, B. and Calverley, A. (2014), *Criminal Careers in transition*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fassin, D., and Rechtman, R., (2009), *The Empire of Trauma: An Inquiry into the Condition of Victimhood*. Trans.: R. Gomme. Princeton University Press. Ferrell, J., (2004), Boredom, Crime and Criminology. *Theoretical Criminology*, 8 (3), 287-302.

Ferrell, J. (2006), *Empire of Scrounge: Inside the Urban Underground of Dumpster Diving, Trash Picking and Street Scavenging* (Alternative Criminology). New York: New York University Press.

Ferrell, J., Hayward, K. and Young, J. (2008), *Cultural Criminology: an Invitation*, London: Sage

Fischer, M., Geiger, B. and Hughes, M.E. (2007), Female recidivists speak about their experience inn drug court while engaging in Appreciative Inquiry, *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 51: 703-722.

Furedi, F. (2004), *Therapy Culture: Cultivating Vulnerability in an Uncertain Age*. London: Routledge.

Gadd, D. & Jefferson, T. (2007). Why psychosocial criminology?. In *Psychosocial criminology: An introduction* (pp. 1-14). London: SAGE

Garapon, A., and Denouveaux, A. (2019), *Victimes, et après?* Paris: Gallimard.

Gatti, G., ed., (2017), *Un Mundo de Víctimas*. Barcelona: Anthropos.

Gondolf, E.W. and Fisher, E.R. (1988), *Battered Women as Survivors: An Alternative to Treating Learned Helplessness*. New York: Lexington.

Goffman, E. (1963), *Stigma: notes on the management of a spoiled identity*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Green, S. Johnstone, G. and Lambert, C. (2013), What harm, Whose Justice?: excavating the restorative movement. *Contemporary Justice Review*. vol. 16(4): 445 – 460.

Green, S. (2015). *Crime, Community and Morality,* London: Routledge.

Green, S. and Pemberton, A. (2017), The Impact of Crime: victimisation, harm and resilience. In S. Walklate (ed.) *The Handbook of Victims and Victimology (pp. 77-102)* (2nd ed.).

Green, S., Kondor, K. & Kidd, A. (2020), Story-telling as memorialisation: suffering, resilience and victim identities. *Oñati Socio-Legal Series*, Practices of Memorialization and the Process of Social Reconstruction after large-scale Human Rights Abuses and Violations, vol. 10(3): 563 – 583.

Hayward, K.J. (2016), Cultural Criminology: Script Rewrites, *Theoretical Criminology*, 20(3): 297 – 321.

Hammond, S.A. (1998), *The Thin Book of Appreciative Inquiry*, Thin Book Publishing, 2nd Edition.

Havens, D.S., Wood, S.O. and Leeman, J. (2006), Improving nursing practice and patient care: Building capacity with appreciative inquiry, *Journal of Nursing Administration*. 36 (10), 463–470.

Healy, D. (2012), Advise, Assist and Befriend. *Social Policy and Administration*, 46 (4): 377 – 394.

Herman, J. (2015), *Trauma and Recovery (with a new Epilogue by the author)*. New York: Basic Books.

Hoff, L.A. (1990), *Battered Women as Survivors*. New York: Routledge

Isen, A.M. (2000), Positive Affect and Decision- Making. In M. Lewis and J.M. Haviland-Jones, eds., *Handbook of Emotions (pp. 417-435)*, NY: Guildford.

Karmen, A. (2020), Crime Victims: An Introduction to Victimology (10th ed.) London: Cengage Learning EMEA.

Katz, J. (1988), *Seductions of Crime: Moral and Sensual Attractions in doing Evil*, New York: Basic Books.

Kelly, L. (1988), *Surviving Sexual Violence*. London: Polity.

Koss, M. P (2014), The RESTORE Program of Restorative Justice for Sex Victims. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol 29 (9):1623-1660.

Laub, J.H. and Sampson, R.J. (2001), Understanding desistance from crime. In M. Tonry and N. Norris, eds., *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research*, 26, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1-78.

Laub, J.H. and Sampson, R.J. (2003), *Shared Beginnings, Divergent Lives*. London: Harvard University Press.

Lauritsen, J. L., Sampson, R. J., and Laub, J. H. (1991), The Link Between offending and Victimisation Among Adolescents. *Criminology*, 29 (2): 265-292.

Liebling, A., (2015), Appreciative Inquiry, Generative Theory, and the 'Failed State Prison'. *Qualitative Research in Criminology. Advances in Criminological Theory. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers*, pp.251-269.

Liebling A., Price, D. and Elliott, C. (1999), Appreciative Inquiry and Relationships in Prison. *Punishment and Society*, 1999 1: 71.

Liebling, A. assisted by Arnold H. (2004), *Prisons and Their Moral Performance: A Study of Values, Quality and Prison Life*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Liebling, A., Elliot, C. and Arnold A. (2001), Transforming the Prison: Romantic Optimism or Appreciative Realism? *Criminal Justice* 1(2): 161-180.

Ludema J.D., Cooperrider, D.L. and Barrett ,F.J. (2001) 'Appreciative inquiry: The Power of the Unconditional Positive Question', in P. Reason P and H. Bradbury (eds), *Handbook of action research*, Sage: London.

Johnstone, L., & Boyle, M. (2018a), The Power Threat Meaning Framework: An Alternative Nondiagnostic Conceptual System. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022167818793289

Johnstone, L. and Boyle, M. with Cromby, J., Dillon, J., Harper, D., Kinderman, P., Longden, E., Pilgrim, D. & Read, J. (2018b), *The Power Threat Meaning Framework: Towards the Identification of Patterns in Emotional Distress, Unusual Experiences and Troubled or Troubling Behaviour, as an Alternative to Functional Psychiatric Diagnosis.* Leicester: British Psychological Society.

Marsh, F. and Wager, N. M. (2015), Restorative Justice in the Cases of Sexual Violence: Exploring the Views of the Public and Survivors. *Probation Journal*, 62(4): 336-356.

Maruna, S. and Farrall, S. (2004), Desistance from Crime: a Theoretical Reformulation. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie and Sozialpsychologie*, 43: 171-194.

Maruna, S. (2001), *Making Good: How Ex-convicts Reform and Rebuild Their Lives*, Washington: American Psychological Association.

Maruna, S. (2017), Desistance and Restorative Justice: it's Now or Never, *Restorative Justice an International Journal* Volume 4, Issue 3, pp 289-301.

Matza, D. (1969), *Becoming Deviant*, London: Prentice Hall.

McAdams, D.P. (1985), *Power, Intimacy, and the Life Story*, New York, Guilford.

McGarry, R. and Walklate, S. (2015), *Victims: Trauma, testimony and justice*. London: Routledge.

Michael, S, (2005), 'The Promise of Appreciative Inquiry as an Interview Tool for Field Research', *Development in Practice*, 15(2) 222-230.

Mythen, G. and McGowan, W. (2017), Cultural Victimology Revisited: Synergies of Risk, Fear and Resilience. In S. Walklate, ed., *Handbook of Victims and Victimology (pp. 107-123)* (2nd ed.), London: Routledge.

Paternoster, R. and Bushway, S. (2009), Desistance and the "feared Self": Toward an Identity Theory of Criminal Desistance. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 99(4): 1103–1156.

Pemberton, A., Aarten, P. G., & Mulder, E. (2019a), Stories as Property: Narrative Ownership as a Key Concept in Victims' Experiences with Criminal Justice. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, *19*(4), 404–420. https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895818778320

Pemberton, A., Mulder, E., & Aarten, P. G. M. (2019b). Stories of Injustice: Towards a Narrative Victimology. *European Journal of Criminology*, *16*(4), 391–412. https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370818770843

Pemberton, J.V. and Loeb, T.B. (2020), Impact of Sexual and Interpersonal Violence and Trauma on Women: Trauma-Informed Practice and Feminist Theory, *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy*, 32:1-2, 115-131, DOI: 10.1080/08952833.2020.1793564

Postma, W. (1998), Capacity-building: The Making of a Curry. *Development in Practice*, *8*(1), pp.54-63.

Presser, L. (2013), *Why We Harm*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Presser, L. (2016), Criminology and the Narrative Turn. *Crime, Media, Culture*, *12*(2), 137–151. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741659015626203

Reed, J. (2007), *Appreciative Inquiry: Research for Change*, London: Sage.

Reed, J., Pearson, P., Douglas, B., Swinburne, S. and Wilding, H. (2002), Going home from hospital: An appreciative inquiry study. *Health and Social Care and the Community*, 10(1), 36-45.

Robinson, A. and Hamilton, P. (Eds.) (2016), *Moving on from Crime and Substance Use*, Bristol, Polity Press.

Robinson, G. and Shapland, J. (2008), Reducing Recidivism: A Task for Restorative Justice? *British Journal of Criminology*, 48 (3): 337-358.

Robinson, G., Priede, C., Farrall, S., Shapland, J. and McNeill, F. (2012), Doing 'strengths' based research: Appreciative Inquiry in a probation setting. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 13(1): 3-20.

Rogers, Carl. (1977), *On Personal Power: Inner Strength and Its Revolutionary Impact*. New York: Delacorte Press.

Roque, M. (2017), *Desistance from Crime: New Advances in Theory and Research'*, New York, Palgrave.

Rossner, M. (2011), Reintegrative Ritual. In S. Karstedt, I. Loader, and H. Strang, eds., *Emotions, Crime and Justice (pp. 169-192).* Oxford: Hart Publishing.

Rumgay, J. (2004), Scripts for Safer Survival: Pathways Out of Female Crime. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 43(4) 405-419.

Shapland, J., Atkinson, A., Atkinson, H., Chapman, B., Dignan, J., Howes, M., Johnstone, J., Robinson, G. and Sorsby, A. (2007), *Restorative Justice*. Ministry of Justice Research Series 3/07. Ministry of Justice: London.

Singer, S. (1981), Homogeneous victim-offender populations. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 72(2): 779-788.

Skultans, V. (1998), *The Testimony of Lives: Narrative and Memory in Post-Soviet Latvia*. London: Routledge.

Sykes, G. and Matza, D. (1957), Techniques of Neutralisation: A Theory of Delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, 22(6): 664-670.

van der Velden, P. G., Wong, A., Boshuizen, H. C. and Grievink, L. (2013), Persistent Mental Health Disturbances During the 10 Years after a Disaster: Four-wave Longitudinal Comparative Study. *Psychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences*, 67: 110–118.

Van Dijk, J. and Steinmetz, C. (1983), Victimisation Surveys. *Victimology*, 8(1-2): 291-309.

Vaughan, B. (2007), The Internal Narrative of Desistance. *British Journal of Criminology*, 47(3): 390-404.

Wager, N. (2013), The Experience and Insight of Survivors Who Have Engaged in a Restorative Justice Meeting with their Assailant. *Temida*, Vol 16(1): 11-32.

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

Walklate, S. (2003) Can there be a Feminist Victimology? in P. Davies, P. Francis and V. Jupp, eds., *Victimisation: Theory, research and policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan

Walklate, S. (2007) Men, Victims and Crime. In P. Davies, P. Francis and V. Jupp, eds., *Crime and Society*. London: Sage. Pp 142 – 164.

Walklate, S. (2012), Who is the Victim of Crime? Paying Homage to the Work of Richard Quinney. *Crime, Media, Culture*, 8(2): 173-184.

Walklate, S., Mythen, G. and McGarry, R. (2013), States of Resilience and the Resilient State, *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, 24(2): 185 – 204.

Walklate, S., McGarry, R., & Mythen, G. (2014), Searching for resilience: A conceptual excavation. *Armed Forces and Society*, 40(3), 408-427. doi:10.1177/0095327X12465419

Walklate, S., Maher, J., McCulloch, J., Fitz-Gibbon, K., & Beavis, K. (2019), Victim Stories and Victim Policy: Is there a Case for a Narrative Victimology? *Crime, Media, Culture*, *15*(2), 199–215. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741659018760105

Ward, T. and Maruna, S. (2007), *Rehabilitation*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Warr, M. (1998), Life-Course Transitions and Desistance From Crime. *Criminology*, 36(2):183-215.

Weaver, B. (2016), *Offending and Desistance: The Importance of Social Relations*. Abingdon: Routledge.