

Droit et cultures

Revue internationale interdisciplinaire

86 | 2024/1

Beyond punishment towards reparation: Explorations of a restorative approach to the harm caused by crimes

Beyond punishment towards reparation: Explorations of a restorative approach to the harm caused by crimes

Restorative Justice and Anti-LGBT Hate Crimes: Experiences and Disparities from the Ground

Justice réparatrice et crimes de haine anti-LGBT : Expériences et disparités sur le terrain

IGNACIO ELPIDIO DOMÍNGUEZ RUIZ, MALIN ROIHA ET OLGA JUBANY

<https://doi.org/10.4000/130dg>

Traduction(s) :

Justice réparatrice et crimes de haine anti-LGBT : Expériences et disparités sur le terrain [fr]

Résumés

English Français

Restorative justice is a complex, debated paradigm often defined as an approach to social justice that prioritizes restoration. It is particularly relevant for addressing anti-LGBT hate crimes and discrimination due to its potential to reduce secondary victimization, improve victim wellbeing, and generate social transformations. Drawing from qualitative interviews with LGBT NGO and justice professionals from six European Union member states, we analyze their experiences with restorative justice in cases of LGBT hate crimes to delineate its practical parameters, as well as its potentialities and limitations, and we identify significant conceptual and experiential dissonances and gaps. We argue that restorative justice processes can be productively designed and adapted, but the existing practices and expectations of our research participants do not always conform to restorative paradigms that achieve these goals, which points to the need for a shift in justice culture and training to implement restorative practices.

La justice restaurative est un paradigme complexe et controversé, souvent défini comme une approche de la justice sociale qui donne la priorité à la restauration. Elle est particulièrement pertinente pour lutter contre les crimes de haine et la discrimination anti-LGBT en raison de son potentiel à réduire la victimisation secondaire, à améliorer le bien-être des victimes et à générer des transformations sociales. À partir d'entretiens qualitatifs avec des associations LGBT et des professionnels de la justice de six États membres de l'Union européenne, nous analysons leur expérience de la justice restaurative dans les cas de crimes de haine contre les personnes LGBT afin de définir ses paramètres pratiques, ainsi que ses potentialités et ses limites, et nous



identifions les dissonances et les lacunes conceptuelles et expérientielles significatives. Nous soutenons que les processus de justice restaurative peuvent être conçus et adaptés de manière productive, mais que les pratiques existantes et les attentes des participants à notre recherche ne sont pas toujours conformes aux paradigmes réparateurs qui permettent d'atteindre ces objectifs, ce qui souligne la nécessité d'un changement dans la culture de la justice et d'une formation à la mise en œuvre de pratiques réparatrices.

Entrées d'index

Mots-clés : justice restaurative, LGBT, crimes de haine, Union européenne

Keywords: restorative justice, LGBT, hate crimes, European Union

Notes de la rédaction

Article updated on 08/07/2025: author addition Olga Jubany.

Texte intégral

Introduction

- 1 'Victims'¹ of anti-LGBT² hate crimes and discrimination suffer psychological traumas as a result of both their direct and secondary victimization during traditional criminal justice processes, including emotional duress and feelings of isolation³. Consequently, using alternative perspectives and practices to assign responsibility for violence and restore victims' well-being can be productive in cases of LGBT hate crimes. These alternative justice practices may also address, on the one hand, the tendency of victims of anti-LGBT hate crimes to under-report hate crimes and, on the other hand, the distrust that these victims often feel towards political and judicial institutions⁴. Restorative justice is one of the processes that has the potential to offer victims of LGBT harassment, discrimination, and hate crimes a more tailored and advantageous experience of justice.
- 2 In this article, we draw on data collected as part of a multi-site research project focusing on the understanding, use, and practical application of restorative justice practices employed by LGBT NGOs and public justice professionals involved in dealing with these crimes and supporting victims in the European Union (EU). We analyze in-depth qualitative interviews with these professionals to assess the potential of restorative measures for victims of anti-LGBT hate crimes. We also question the limits of current restorative justice practices used by NGOs and public institutions to address the specific needs of victims of anti-LGBT hate crime. The professionals from public justice administrations and LGBT NGOs we interviewed report a wide range of experiences and expectations about what anti-LGBT 'victimization', but also the role and nature of justice and restitution.
- 3 Our argument contributes to the growing body of literature on how restorative measures are understood, designed, and employed and how they contrast with existing justice systems and procedures, particularly in the specific context of LGBT hate crimes. Restorative justice, understood as an alternative or a complement to traditional procedural justice, offers additional agency and participation for victims, and as such, may be necessary for hate crime victims. However, as this article shows, 'restorative justice' is not necessarily a simple concept or practice, and its potential stakeholder may understand it in different or even contradictory ways. Consequently, we argue that the way restorative justice is understood can affect the willingness and access of its potential stakeholders to restorative measures. Based on our empirical research, we argue that restorative justice opens a debate within LGBT victimization and victim support services, as it makes professionals question their own conception of justice and support. It also contributes to a deeper understanding of how NGOs and public

institutions deal with anti-LGBT hate crime victimization the beneficial and detrimental effects that flow from it, because of the links between potential restorative measures and practices that victim support professionals may already be using without them being explicitly recognized as restorative justice practices. We argue that restorative justice processes can be productively designed and adapted to enable victims of anti-LGBT hate crimes to be heard and cared for, to play an active role in obtaining justice and to overcome their feelings of isolation. However, the very diverse conceptualizations, expectations, and practices of our research participants do not always align with restorative paradigms that achieve these goals, underscoring the need for a shift in judicial culture and training to implement effective restorative practices. This shift must also take into account legal and cultural differences regarding legal practices and expectations.

- 4 Our argument unfolds in four main sections. We begin by describing anti-LGBT hate crimes and victimization experiences, based on previous research that also addresses how restorative justice can respond to these specific experiences. Next, we present our methodology, focused on qualitative research with professionals from LGBT organizations and victim support services. The third section builds on our original empirical material and analyzes how restorative justice is understood and practiced by our participants, while the fourth section analyzes how professionals understand its application to anti-LGBT hate crimes. In this section, we discuss a significant conceptual gap between different professional backgrounds is discussed, particularly regarding the potential application of restorative techniques to anti-LGBT cases. This gap is the article's main contribution, as it points to training and cooperation needs that could enable restorative practitioners and other victim support and justice professionals to fully realize the potential of restoration for victims of anti-LGBT hate.

Anti-LGBT Hate Crimes and Restorative Justice

- 5 When LGBT individuals, or those perceived as such, are victims of hate crimes, they frequently experience negative consequences related to their physical and psychological well-being⁵, which can exacerbate pre-existing physical and mental health issues⁶. Like with other forms of hate crimes involving physical and verbal attacks, anti-LGBT violence diminishes the well-being of both direct and indirect victims⁷. Direct victims may experience actual physical harm, but also emotional harm such as feelings of fear, shock, anxiety, isolation, duress, and depression⁸. They may also experience discrimination from social services and public institutions when seeking support.⁹ Indirect victims are people who identify as LGBT but experience anti-LGBT violence indirectly, as part of a wider marginalized community that is made collectively fearful of these hate crimes.
- 6 According to the latest survey on LGBT victimization, conducted by the EU Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA) in 2019, eleven percent of respondents had experienced a physical and/or sexual attack in the five years prior to the survey¹⁰. While the survey data demonstrates significant heterogeneity in respondents' experiences across different sexual and gender identities, it also highlights the widespread under-reporting of anti-LGBT violence, which is also characteristic of other forms of hate crimes¹¹.
- 7 According to the FRA's LGBT 2019 survey, 10 percent of respondents had suffered harassment episodes, but only 4 percent reported the harassment to the police¹². Although physical and sexual attacks are less common than harassment, these types of attacks are more frequently reported. However, even in this case, only 21 percent of respondents reported these types of aggression to the police or social organizations. Respondents explained this under-reporting as a combination of a lack of trust in the reporting systems and relevant institutions, previous negative experiences of the

reporting process, and having heard of other people's troubling experiences of reporting¹³. A deep mistrust of police forces and public administrations, in concert with the limited resources available to tackle anti-LGBT discrimination, hate crime and wider social discrimination, are key factors in the widespread failure to report such violence.

8 Judicial systems and procedures that fail to respond to victims of anti-LGBT hate crimes also engender negative experiences and perceptions of judicial institutions¹⁴. For example, the 2017 study by Walters and al. into transgender people's experiences and perceptions of the effectiveness and responsiveness of UK justice systems in responding to anti-LGBT hate crimes shows a widespread lack of trust in how the police treat victims and their needs. This lack of trust is particularly strong when victims have previous experience of dealing with police and justice professionals. This study highlights how the political and judicial handling of hate crimes against minorities generates widespread prejudices against these institutions, but also a rise in community identity and solidarity.

9 Negative perceptions of traditional justice systems contrast with LGBT people's preference for restorative justice measures, according to the study by Waters et al.¹⁵. According to their survey, LGBT individuals would prefer to participate in a restorative justice process, but those who have already been victims of anti-LGBT hate crimes also favor harsher sentences for perpetrators. The widespread use of enhanced sentencing for hate crimes in traditional justice systems may have an impact on victims' expectations of justice, as well as their lack of awareness of alternatives, such as restorative programs¹⁶. However, restorative justice is a potentially favorable alternative for dealing with hate crimes because of its flexibility, its focus on the well-being of victims and its ability to change attitudes and prejudices¹⁷. The role that a dialogue-based and empathy-building approach plays in this process makes it particularly well-suited to hate crime cases, as dialogue often helps offenders understand the victim's experiences of violence¹⁸. However, this potential can be compromised by gendered power relations that often structure the dialogical process and, more generally, restorative justice measures¹⁹.

10 Restorative justice has proven effective for different types of hate crimes, but particularly for anti-LGBT hate crimes²⁰. Rather than a precise set of practices and protocols, restorative justice should be understood as a paradigm of justice and conflict resolution that emphasizes agency and participation of both parties, as well as means of harm reparation. It has many definitions, and this complex and imprecise conceptualization allows it to be practiced in different ways, although the common goal is to achieve restorative results²¹. The most common approaches are victim-offender mediation or reconciliation; community, family, and group conferencing, which may include the offender or only the harmed parties; sentencing and peacemaking circles; reparation probation; community and justice board panels; and administrative hearings²².

11 In summary, this section has addressed the limitations that traditional procedural justice can offer to victims of anti-LGBT hate crimes. These limitations relate particularly to psychological support, agency, and satisfaction with justice and police services, particularly given the rate of under-reporting of such crimes in the EU and internationally. In this context, restorative measures can serve as a complement or alternative to procedural justice, as they offer potentially more opportunities for participation, agency, and satisfaction for victims and other involved parties. This potential has been studied for victims and LGBT people with promising results regarding their willingness to engage in restorative practices. However, this willingness or predisposition, as well as how restoration is understood, needs to be studied in other contexts too, including those of professionals interacting with victims within LGBT NGOs and victim support groups, especially as these stakeholders may have the function of gatekeepers for LGBT victims who wish to participate in restorative processes. To this end, qualitative research offers a particularly fruitful vantage point

for shedding light on professionals' motivations, knowledge, and experiences regarding restorative justice.

Methodology

- 12 Our analysis is based on data collected during a two-year research project conducted in six European countries: Belgium, Bulgaria, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, and Spain. It was based on the Directive²³ 2012/29/EU, which aims to strengthen the rights of victims of crime, and is framed by this Directive by examining the perspectives of victims and relevant professionals on these rights in the context of anti-LGBT hate crimes. The research team was mainly made up of academic social anthropologists, as well as some lawyers and NGO practitioners. The research explored research participants' different experiences and expectations of dealing with anti-LGBT hate crimes and discrimination particularly in relation to restorative justice, as well as their often conflicting notions of justice, agency, and responsibility.
- 13 The research built on previous EU-wide studies on homophobia and transphobia²⁴, and included a comparative and transferable perspective that takes into account differences between and within EU member states. These differences concern the way in which EU member states regulate rights and procedures adopted throughout the European Union. For instance, the right to restorative services may be adapted or transposed to national legislations with wordings and frames that affect victims' rights. The comparative dimension also includes an in-depth examination of the societal and cultural expectations of justice and legal institutions. Thus, research in each country was conducted by teams from local institutions, while the analytical tools were designed to promote comparability and transferability.
- 14 The larger project employed both quantitative and qualitative methods, as it sought to contrast restorative justice knowledge and experiences throughout a wide range of NGOs and institutions, on the one hand, to detailed, in-depth knowledge of how professionals understand justice, restoration, and victims' needs and rights. This mixed-methods approach made it possible to triangulate and compare data between the six participant countries²⁵. Our team focused on conducting qualitative interviews to understand our participants' expectations, opinions, knowledge, and experiences related to anti-LGBT hate crimes and their punishment. The onset of the COVID-19 pandemic required us to adapt interviews for an online setting, although we did manage to conduct a few face-to-face interviews with professionals from Bulgaria, Belgium, and Italy. This change in interview protocol had an impact on the choice of research participants, we had hoped to interview victims of hate crimes as well. However, as research on victims' rights and experiences of LGBT-phobia suggests that a comfortable, supportive, and safe environment is necessary for fruitful and ethical interactions with vulnerable people, we decided to forego interviews with victims and focus exclusively on professionals. Indeed, we could not guarantee a safe space for victims to express themselves freely in the context of the pandemic. The professionals, on the other hand, quickly adapted to online forms of communication.
- 15 The study of how professionals understand and practice restoration, if they do so, required an in-depth, qualitative approach to how they perceive justice, victims' needs, and their role and agency within support agencies and services. As such, our research therefore focused on in-depth interviews with professionals working with victims whether in victim support services, LGBT NGOs, or public institutions. To build a sample, we recruited participants from the survey phase of the research, but also by employing a snowball sampling technique. Our sample includes 104 professionals working in either restorative justice programs or victim support and LGBT NGOs, such as prosecutors, judges, facilitators, mediators, scholars, researchers, victim support technicians, hate crimes lawyers, and representatives from public institutions. Sixty-two are professionals within the justice system, 35 work in LGBT NGOs, and 7 are

policymakers or members of non-discrimination bodies in public institutions, such as city councils, regional, and national governments.

- 16 Despite the consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic in terms of methodology, a qualitative research (mainly online) produced more than enough insights and data to conduct an in-depth analysis of how professionals involved with restorative justice and anti-LGBT hate crimes understand the intersection between their fields, experiences, and practices. The data produced also included a wide range of cultural and societal expectations drawing from six countries with sufficiently different legal traditions and expectations.

Restorative Justice: Understandings and Techniques

- 17 Throughout the interviews, professionals from the six countries involved demonstrated varying degrees of experience and knowledge regarding restorative justice, mainly due to their professional and training backgrounds. Thus, restorative justice facilitators and victim support professionals were among the professionals with the clearest knowledge of the conceptual and practical alternatives of restoration, for instance. This divide must, however, be linked to the way in which societies in different countries understand and perceive restorative justice, and this is also related to the degree to which national legislation on the subject has been developed or implemented. For instance, professionals in the Netherlands, where restorative practices have long been part of the traditional or main judicial institutions, have more homogeneous views than professionals in Spain, where public restorative justice services are available in few regions. Cultural perspectives on justice as punishment also come into play: Italian professionals, for instance, explained that the Italian population was unlikely to support a politician who advocates for a less punitive approach to justice, while some Spanish NGO professionals also argued that many victims associate justice with punishment, and as such would likely prefer a traditional or procedural approach that ends with a clear cut sentence of the offending party.

- 18 These divergent views, identified in and between all countries, are linked to broader notions of what justice is, informed by both cultural norms and expectations and by justice-related practices. A former NGO representative, currently working for a Spanish government body, drew on Roman and earlier notions of justice to explain that restorative measures run counter to a common understanding of justice: “we have a concept of justice linked to that of punishment and revenge, instead of that of a radical solution to the problem of violence or crime” (ES-P-6)²⁶. This perspective can be seen as a consequence of the centuries-old track record of the “*Lex Talionis* framework of negative reciprocity” that serves as the backbone of what Heffernan²⁷ has characterized as a retaliation model of justice: a justice culture based on the expectation of punishment as a negative response or backlash against offenders, or an “eye for eye, tooth for tooth”.

- 19 According to most professionals, this idea of justice directly affects the way victims perceive their own needs and expectations. Thus, cultural norms and expectations have a key role regarding the possibilities for restorative approaches. On the one hand, several LGBT NGO professionals mentioned that victims want punishment and even revenge, understanding these as inextricable aspects of justice. For instance, a lawyer working for an LGBT NGO questioned victims’ willingness to participate in restorative processes: “I think they’re unwilling because they just want justice after what they endured, to have some justice, in a wide sense that if I have a problem I want a solution” (ES-P-16). On the other hand, restorative practitioners and victim support professionals from public institutions have a different perception. Several of them even criticized LGBT NGOs’ role as promoters of this punitive culture observed through campaigns that focus on reporting, official complaints, and fines and sentences as the main or only

way of obtaining justice. A former LGBT activist, working for the Spanish Ministry for Equality, questioned the way in which NGOs focus excessively on formal reports and judicial procedures, thus reproducing a widespread punitive conception according to which “justice just being the punishment and that’s it, and there’s also a certain component of revenge if I may, not necessarily by the victims but in general, by society [...]” (ES-P-6).

20 Thus, differences in judicial cultures can be seen as a key factor regarding both professionals’ and victims’ willingness to participate in restorative approaches. However, rather than as a static factor, culture should be seen as a contextual and dynamic element. The fact that in some countries, such as the Netherlands and Belgium, fewer negative views or concerns were found regarding the application of restorative justice must be linked not only to a static view of culture but to the effect of existing institutions and practices that disseminate and publicize restorative approaches. Consequently, institutions, including NGOs, are significant actors in shaping a society’s cultural expectations of justice and restoration.

21 Besides the cultural aspect, professionals in all six countries acknowledge that restorative justice can fit within Western systems of laws and ideas about human rights. Even though most of them express overwhelmingly positive opinions about the effectiveness of restorative approaches, both for victims and for judicial systems, they note significant difficulties linked to their implementation. One of the main challenges identified is that of the differences between legal systems and existing institutions and resources devoted not only to punitive justice, but also to victim support, mediation, and restorative approaches. The comparison between the Netherlands and Belgium, on the one hand, and Italy and Spain, on the other, showed the difference between having nation-wide restorative institutions or experiences (Belgium and the Netherlands) and local or regional ones (Italy and Spain). The analysis of spatial differences within a single country, such as in the cases of Poland and Spain, also linked the resources devoted to restorative approaches to political will and the availability of resources. In the case of Poland, most restorative approaches depend on specific judges or institutions, while in Spain, the only restorative justice services on regional scale are limited to the wealthiest autonomous communities (regions), including Catalonia and the Basque Country.

22 Throughout these professionals’ reflections about the workability of restorative justice as part of widespread cultural notions of justice, we did identify the key role of the professionals’ knowledge, experiences, and willingness regarding restorative measures. As a result, different professional profiles or backgrounds offered significantly different notions about what victims want, even though all professionals did share the understanding that restorative measures are not well-known among the general population. Among the professionals directly involved in restorative measures in courthouses or public services, on the one hand, we found that victims are generally open to restorative measures, because they want lasting and real solutions to conflicts and crimes. Among professionals from LGBT NGOs, on the other hand, we found a more diverse range of responses about what they believe victims want. Some consider that victims may want to use restorative measures when or if they are offered, whereas some NGO professionals argued that victims do not want such measures. A Dutch professional argued that victims may keep their experiences to themselves, not only because they don’t report them, but also because they want to deal with the situation:

“Usually, victims want to silence their experienced hate crimes, they do not want to talk about it at all. Lots of victims think that they have to keep their own issues aside in order to help other people, it can be a coping mechanism of a lot of people from the LGBT community.” (NL-P-13)

23 Another important factor influencing how professionals perceive the feasibility of restorative practices is that of funding and other resources, including bureaucratic barriers and procedures. A Polish participant, for instance, asserted that the main barrier for restorative measures in her country is “ignorance, thoughtlessness, and

short-sighted perspective of one's own benefit, which means I'll just finish the case faster, I'll get it over with, I'll push it onto the second instance, to court, whatever happens with it later on is no longer my problem" (PL-P-12). Regarding funding, most professionals argued that the lack of resources for restorative measures and other justice services greatly impact the possibilities for victim support and restorative services. The comparative nature of the research made it possible to observe a wide range of regions and public administrations with different degrees of support and funding for restorative programs, and this was criticized by several professionals from a geographical lens, as it contributes to an unequal access to the right to restorative justice services.

24 As for bureaucratic support or the role of restoration in existing judicial procedures and practices, most professionals criticized a short-sighted understanding of justice and bureaucratic practices as cost-effective, heavily protocolized activities, where the staff involved are under pressure to keep them short, fast, and trouble-free. The role of protocolization was mentioned by several restorative practitioners, as it affects the way they can respond to victims' needs. They questioned the heavy protocolization of the most frequent processes they implement as part of their roles within public victim support and restorative justice services. For instance, a facilitator who works mainly with minors explained how his work mainly involves organizing bilateral restorative meetings or mediation processes with students after conflicts between them. Although he can organize broader and more complex practices or dynamics, he tends to have little space for flexibility or use of most techniques, as juvenile mediation is heavily protocolized in Spain (ES-P-9). Similarly, an academic and facilitator who works at a public university conducts restorative processes as part of an agreement with two courthouses. Their work in these courthouses involves not only criminal law, but above all restorative encounters between interested parties in labor, family, and other civil matters (ES-P-11).

25 Despite this view of restoration as a series of fixed practices due to bureaucratic pressure and an ever-growing workload, other professionals explained how flexibility is embedded in their activities. For instance, a professional from a public administration's LGBT victim support service explained that their program has a hands-on approach to restoration, although it has the option of referring cases to a restorative justice institution. She explained that "on many occasions we do [the mediation] directly ourselves, in an easy way: we inform the victim, we inform the offender, we place one in front of the other, and we do the mediation" (ES-P-2). Her description of this role is directly linked to a flexible understanding of a restorative process: instead of applying a predefined protocol, they take into account the specific needs of each case — both in terms of the needs of the victim and those of the offender. However, this practice may be questioned due to the potential lack of trained facilitators and to the apparent confusion of restorative justice in placing a victim in front of an offender. Similarly, a participant from Poland even asserted that restorative justice "is not like some legal provision, [...] but rather a way of proceeding, [...] a way of interpreting the law and following it" (PL-P-14).

26 In this context, several restorative justice experts have defended the key role of flexibility as an essential element of their roles and tasks. They compared a flexible or open mindset to a series of closed protocols or fixed practices, and defended flexibility as an essential necessity for useful restorative measures. One of the participants explicitly spoke of what she called "the adequacy paradigm" (ES-P-11), i.e. the need for a flexible understanding of restorative justice and restoration as a process in which different measures and approaches need to be combined and contemplated on a case-by-case basis, which also includes the need to determine the best moment for each measure, if deemed possible. This flexibility also implies the victim's right to refuse to participate, as "the opportunity to say 'no' also gives the victim power and strength" (NL-P-6).

27 In summary, our research provides a complex view of restorative justice as it is understood and practiced, either directly or indirectly, by a wide range of professionals

involved with victims. Even within a seemingly common legal context of EU-backed rights and laws, professionals and victims face an uneven landscape of legislation and protocols, or lack thereof, concerning the application of restorative justice. Cultural or societal expectations of what justice entails or implies are also key factors that vary between and within countries. Our research shows how professionals navigate this landscape, with a deep understanding of the contrast between what victims and professionals need, and the legislation and resources available to them. Where protocols and procedures exist, however, they are not set in stone; rather, they are opportunities for professionals, in which they can productively combine a wide range of tools and strategies to their discretion if not proscribed otherwise. Just as the absence of specific legislation or protocols does not necessarily preclude the application of restorative strategies, their legal definition and promotion does not necessarily equate to their effective implementation. This context is therefore linked to the applicability of restorative measures, or lack thereof, particularly in cases of hate crime, as in some countries they may not be legislated as such. Professionals' understanding of the intersection between restoration and anti-LGBT victims is therefore based on an interweaving of legislation, cultural conceptions of justice, and their previous experiences with restorative justice processes.

Restorative Practices for Anti-LGBT Hate Crimes and Discriminations

28 What precisely is meant as justice or restoration from the perspective of LGBT victims does play a significant role. Drawing on Nils Christie's²⁸ seminal article on conflicts as property, our research looked at how professionals and LGBT communities envisioned anti-LGBT hate incidents, and under whose agency or prerogative they fell under. The comparison with gender-based violence, for which criminal mediation is currently prohibited in countries such as Spain²⁹, as well as the role of power imbalances and extremist ideologies, led most LGBT NGO professionals to doubt the usefulness of restorative measures in the case of anti-LGBT hate crimes. For instance, a lawyer working mostly with LGBT migrants and refugees explained that

broadly speaking these aren't measures that really work with hate issues, just as they don't work either with gender-based violence. [...] In this case, the offender, 90 percent of the time, isn't sorry about the situation they have provoked for the victim. [...] we may be able to find that [repentance] with another issue. I don't know, rape, sexual aggression, or issues of murder, homicide, even issues of [terrorism] or things like that [...]. (ES-P-10)

29 Professionals from public services, including judicial institutions and victim support services, shared very different views on the interests and needs of anti-LGBT victims, drawing on their professional experience. In this way, they acknowledge that they are well aware of the doubts of NGO professionals, and criticize the way in which LGBT NGOs can act as gatekeepers when it comes to the use of restorative measures for anti-LGBT hate crimes and discrimination. Restorative justice practitioners have drawn on the existing professional and academic debate on neutrality or impartiality³⁰. They highlighted the victim's wellbeing and needs as the central tenet, and defended the necessary flexibility and case-by-case basis for the evaluation of each victim's needs. For instance, a Polish restorative justice practitioner argued that restorative measures have to be understood from the victim's perspective and that "[it] should never end, [as] it is a continual process" (PL-P-12). These arguments evoke nuanced views on impartiality as distinct to neutrality, similar to those of the European Forum for Restorative Justice, when it advocates that even despite the facilitator's "impartial role between the conflicting parties, restorative justice itself is not neutral, but it actively addresses victims' (and offenders') needs"³¹.

30 The way in which these professionals conceive of restoration is directly linked, throughout our research, to their understanding of the victims' role and centrality in support and justice processes and services. In other words, many professionals argued for the need for victim agency and centrality, particularly for those affected by hate crimes or incidents. An implicit comparison with traditional or procedural justice is thus part of this argument, as practitioners' strategies are legitimated from the victim's perspective. These arguments also entail an implicit comparison with traditional or procedural justice as restorative practices are explained from a perspective of justice that does not mistreat victims, while also offering voluntary participation by offenders. However, the arguments deployed by the interviewees do not go beyond traditional notions of the responsibility or property under discussion when it comes to anti-LGBT hate crimes. Whereas victims do play an increasingly important role, these professionals still see the conflict as a public, even institutional issue. This may be linked to the way which hate crimes are understood by European and national legislations: even in countries with specific restorative legislation and measures, they may still be understood from a traditional conception of crime as a conflict managed by the State.

31 Linked to this shared critique of traditional procedural justice, concerning victims' roles and agency, both restorative practitioners and professionals from other public institutions argued specifically for the relevance and potential of restorative processes for anti-LGBT cases. In this regard respect, most professionals highlighted potential benefits of restorative justice, such as reduced recidivism, better experiences, and more agency for victims, as well as a potential for change and gains for the society. For example, a Bulgarian participant argued for the empathy-building capabilities of restorative measures: "The more distant you feel the other person, the more likely you are to hurt them" and, as such, "The more you perceive them as yourself, as a closer (person), as a human being, similar to you, the less likely you are to hurt them" (BG- P-4). Similarly, a Dutch professional asserted that with restorative measures: "The victim becomes a real person for the offender..." (NL-P-14). Most Italian professionals, meanwhile, shared the potential usefulness of these measures not only for the victim, but also for the offenders and for the communities involved or affected, given the collective aspect of hate crimes.

32 The reference to indirect victims and affected communities has enabled several practitioners to advocate for the usefulness of restorative justice for hate crimes, particularly when it comes considering techniques that go beyond protocolized or boilerplate direct mediation. For instance, restorative practitioners with experience working with both minors and adults have stressed the need for a case-by-case analysis of the victims' and offenders' needs. This tailor-made approach can be summarized by "the adequacy paradigm", as a perspective that enables practitioners to design procedures tailored for the specific circumstances of a case. The identity-based nature of hate crimes and incidents, as well as their community impact, has enabled these and other professionals to defend the potential of community-based techniques, such as restorative circles, as particularly well-suited to addressing the role of identity, sense of community, and potential feelings of isolation that victims of hate crime may experience. The role of dialogue and empathy in changing the prejudices and values of offenders and community members was also highlighted, with indirect techniques and community-based measures also recommended to facilitate social transformation and to reduce recidivism.

33 Faced with this flexible understanding of restoration, most NGO professionals saw restorative justice as an extension of direct mediation encounters, or victim-offender mediation. This view, drawn from the more established presence of labor mediation in several of the participating countries, clashed with restorative justice practitioners' views on what can be used or conceived as restoration. Instead, these NGO professionals considered a wider range of possible techniques including early education, diversity and sensitivity training, community services with social organizations, and tailored actions in response to specific offenses. Some professionals with a more direct

knowledge of restorative practices even discussed the limits of mediation, as its aim is often to reach agreement, whereas the main objective of the broader paradigm of restorative justice is the restoration or healing of the victims.

34 As a result, we identified a significant conceptual gap between how different professional backgrounds and experiences contribute to differing understandings of restoration and its potential techniques. Under the light of this dissonance, however, several LGBT NGO professionals acknowledged that their organizations are already applying several restorative measures, without considering them as such. If we stick to a strict conception of reparation limited to direct meditation, for instance, discussions and visits to high schools and training of police forces and other public institutions, which are common practices among many LGBT NGOs, are not part of a restorative paradigm. Under a wider or more flexible approach, on the other hand, they are inspired by the goal of reparation. We have therefore identified a conceptual veil that constitutes an obstacle to NGOs engagement with restorative justice as a paradigm and as a set of techniques. This gap lies not only in the fact that the promotion of a wider understanding of restorative strategies could enable professionals to see their practice as such, but also in a misunderstanding between restorative justice practitioners and NGO representatives who may not perceive the commonalities between their respective practices, and their shared goal to protect the victim and addressing the victim's needs.

35 This conceptual and practice-based gap, which is the main contribution of this article, should be understood as a consequence of the contrast or distance between different understandings of justice and restoration. On the one hand, judicial services, victim support and LGBT NGOs need a certain degree of protocolization in order to provide homogeneous or comparable services. On the other hand, broader understanding of restoration as an ubiquitous approach or principle makes its direct definition and protocolization difficult. This contrast is further fueled by current debates about the conceptual vagueness of restorative justice, as it has been defined in different and even contradictory ways³². To this issue Kathleen Daly responds by proposing to understand restorative justice as a "justice mechanism" within a broader "innovative justice umbrella" that might in fact encompass existing NGO practices.

36 Therefore, our research among two main groups or professional backgrounds allows us to suggest several potential bridges between different understandings and expectations about restorative justice for anti-LGBT cases. Such a conceptual and practice divide could be bridged by an explicit understanding of innovative justice practices that involve offender-, victim-, and community-based practices and that go beyond or counter punitive approaches. Within this broader framework of innovative justice, explicit restorative justice measures could be distinguished as they are designed, conceived, and implemented by restorative justice services. Some restorative justice practitioners, such as the restorative service in the Basque country (Spain), have considered and put into practice another possibility for reconciliation. This practitioner has stressed the relevance of involving community representatives and NGO professionals in restorative processes, either as a separate party or indirect victim in a process, or as support to the direct victim. The restorative justice practitioners interviewed acknowledged that this type of involvement differs from current practices by NGOs such as LGBT organizations, which are more accustomed to playing the role of advocates, legal advisors or defendants, or psychological support providers. As such, a reorientation of these organizations' involvement can also be seen as a knowledge and practice gap to be taken into account and filled, always bearing in mind the well-being of victims. Participation in restorative processes implemented as part of restorative justice programs, would also enable LGBT NGOs to familiarize themselves with these processes and deepen their understanding of the benefits of restorative justice, as Millington³³ has also asserted.

37 In summary, restorative justice offers a wide range of potential benefits that may respond to the needs and circumstances of anti-LGBT victims. Unlike traditional procedural justice, restorative measures can offer more instances of agency, participation, and satisfaction for both direct and indirect victims, with community

representatives also potentially playing a key role. However, our research unveiled significant conceptual differences between two groups of professionals. On the one hand, LGBT NGO professionals limit their vision of restoration to victim-offender mediation and strongly doubt its relevance in anti-LGBT cases. Restorative practitioners and victim support professionals, on the other hand, considered a wider range of techniques and approaches that they believe are particularly relevant to the needs of these cases. Thus, we have identified a relevant conceptual and practice gap about in how restoration is understood in anti-LGBT cases, with significant effects regarding its potential application.

Conclusions

38 The current state of knowledge highlights the specific potential of restorative measures for anti-LGBT hate crimes and discrimination. As opposed to a redistributive justice, restorative practices can provide a more lasting reconciliation that, despite its comparative difficulties, “has the ability to transform individuals, communities and whole societies”³⁴. Under this light, the experiences and expectations of professionals working with victims of anti-LGBT hate crimes and discrimination intersect with broader societal discourses and practices of justice, responsibility, and retribution. How justice is understood, and what role restoration may play in it, affect how professionals and victims engage with different justice techniques and procedures. Cultural or societal conceptions of justice and reparation, for instance, make this a varied landscape, with significant differences between and within countries. Drawing on extensive research with restorative justice professionals, public institutions, and LGBT NGOs, this article has identified and addressed the gaps in knowledge and practice between professional backgrounds, and their direct impact on the application of restorative measures in cases of anti-LGBT hate crimes and discrimination.

39 Although most professionals see restoration as an alternative or contrast to traditional punitive justice, the way it is specifically understood or envisioned as a practice greatly differed, both in general terms and in the specific field of anti-LGBT hate crimes. Among LGBT NGO professionals who have not received specific training in restorative justice, for instance, we identified mixed doubts about its practical application due to the perceived nature of hate crimes. Restorative practitioners and victim support professionals from public institutions, on the other hand, counterargued with a defense of methodological flexibility as a key to unlock the potential of restorative justice for anti-LGBT hate crimes. This perceptual contrast is also linked to how these professionals envision potential techniques for their application: whereas most NGO professionals only considered victim-offender mediation, restorative practitioners and other professionals argued for a wider approach that includes other practices, including several ones that are already being implemented by LGBT NGOs.

40 In the face of this conceptual and practice-based divide, our research has identified potential bridges between the participant professionals. One potential link is the integration of a community or broader understanding of the parties involved in restorative processes, with LGBT NGOs potentially playing a direct or indirect role in these processes. Another potential link is the integration of a broader restorative mindset into existing practices, as a way of understanding the parties’ needs and roles. This would involve a shift in focus, toward the victim’s and other parties’ needs and perspectives, and this shift is an integral part of the contrast or relationship between restorative and retributive justice. This shift could involve the extension of restorative justice services, but also the explicit incorporation of a broader innovative approach to justice with offender-, victim-, and community-based practices. A final necessary shift identified is a cultural one, as the role of a society’s expectations regarding justice has been analyzed as a key factor that facilitates or limits the application of restorative approaches. Rather than a static dimension, culture should be seen as a changing

landscape in which public institutions and NGOs play an important role in publicizing or promoting specific actions and expectations.

41 Our research findings point profound implications for public policies, practice exchange, and training needs and materials for different professional backgrounds. The contrast between different professionals' expectations, knowledge, and understanding of justice, restoration, and victims' needs helps make the case for interdisciplinary collaboration and training. LGBT NGO professionals, on the one hand, and restorative practitioners and public victim support professionals, on the other hand, have compatible skills and training needs, and our research has identified significant collaboration that could improve professionals' approach to the needs of anti-LGBT victims. However, to the specific perspective of direct victims, the COVID-19 pandemic did not allow our research to interview victims of anti-LGBT hate crimes and discrimination. Further research could therefore complement the data and reflections from the different perspectives of professionals with those of victims. The knowledge and practical gap identified between professionals may provide a very different experience from that of victims, and it would therefore be necessary to complement the research presented in this paper with a closer examination of their expectations and knowledge of restorative justice and its role within systems.

Notes

1 We employ the term 'victim' because it – and 'victimhood' – is used by the professionals we interviewed to refer to the people to whom they provide support. In doing so, they adhere to understandings of victimization processes that are out of step with current debates that challenge the harms done to survivors by employing 'victimhood' language and perspectives. See: D. L. Rothe and D. Kauzlarich, « We are all complicit: Victimization and crimes of the powerful », in Sandra Walklate (Ed.) *Handbook of Victims and Victimology*, Abingdon-on-Thames, Routledge, 2019, p. 348-363; N. Chakraborti, « Victims of hate crimes », in Sandra Walklate (Ed.) *Handbook of Victims and Victimology*, Abingdon-on-Thames, Routledge, 2019, p. 141-155.

2 Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals.

3 M. A. Walters, *Hate crimes and restorative justice: Exploring causes, repairing harms*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014.

4 FRA: European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, *EU-LGBTI II: A long way to go for LGBTI equality*, Brussels, Publications Office of the European Union, 2020. A. C. Sullivan, A. C. H. Ong, S. T. La Macchia and W. R. Louis, « The impact of unpunished hate crimes: When derogating the victim extends into derogating the group », *Social Justice Research*, 29, 3, 2016, p. 310-330.

5 Mark A. Walters, *op. cit.*

6 E. H. Mereish and M. S. Taylor, « Sexual and gender minority people's physical health and health risk behaviors », in Kevin L. Nadal and María R. Scharrón-del Río (Eds.) *Queer Psychology*, New York City, Springer, 2021, p. 81-102; S. N. Rees, M. Crowe and S. Harris, « The lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender communities' mental health care needs and experiences of mental health services: An integrative review of qualitative studies », *Journal of Psychiatric & Mental Health Nursing*, 28, 4, 2021, p. 578-589.

7 P. Iganski and S. Lagou, « Hate crimes hurt some more than others: Implications for the just sentencing of offenders », *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 30, 10, 2015, p. 1696-1718.

8 Mark A. Walters, *op. cit.*

9 Mark A. Walters, *op. cit.*

10 FRA, *op. cit.*

11 FRA: European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, *Encouraging hate crime reporting: The role of law enforcement and other authorities*, Brussels, Publications Office of the European Union, 2021; F. S. Pezzella and M. D. Fetzer, « Victim underreporting », in F. S. Pezzella and M. D. Fetzer (Eds.) *The measurement of hate crimes in America*, New York City, Springer, 2021, p. 93-101; F. S. Pezzella, M. D. Fetzer and T. Keller, « The dark figure of hate crime underreporting », *American Behavioral Scientist*, OnlineFirst.

12 FRA, 2020, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

13 FRA, 2020, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

14 N. A. Palmer and B. L. Kutateladze, « What prosecutors and the police should do about underreporting of anti-LGBTQ hate crime », *Sexuality Research & Social Policy*, 19, 2022, p.

1190-1204; M. A. Walters, J. Paterson, R. Brown and L. McDonnell, « Hate crimes against trans people: Assessing emotions, behaviors, and attitudes towards criminal justice agencies », *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 35, 21-22, 2017, p. 4583-4613.

15 M. A. Walters, J. L. Paterson and R. Brown, « Enhanced punishment or repairing harms? Perceptions of sentencing hate crimes amongst members of a commonly targeted victim group », *British Journal of Criminology*, 61, 1, 2021, p. 61-84.

16 L. Kayali and M. A. Walters, « Responding to hate incidents on university campuses: Benefits and barriers to establishing a restorative justice programme », *Contemporary Justice Review*, 24, 1, 2021, p. 64-84.

17 M. A. Walters, 2014, *op. cit.*

18 M. S. Umbreit, T. Lewis and H. Burns, « A community response to a 9/11 hate crime: Restorative justice through dialogue », *Contemporary Justice Review*, 6, 4, 2003, p. 383-391; R. B. Coates, M. S. Umbreit and B. Vos, « Responding to hate crimes through restorative justice dialogue », *Contemporary Justice Review*, 9, 1, 2006, p. 7-21.

19 J. Stubbs, « Gendered violence and restorative justice », in A. Hayden, L. Gelsthorpe and A. Morris (Eds.), *A restorative approach to family violence*, Abingdon-on-Thames, Routledge, 2014; K. Daly and J. Stubbs, « Feminist theory, feminist and anti-racist politics, and restorative justice », in G. Johnstone and D. W. Van Ness (Eds.) *Handbook of Restorative Justice*, Cullompton, Willan, 2006, p. 139-170.

20 K. Goh, « Safe cities and queer spaces: The urban politics of radical LGBT activism », *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 108, 2, 2018, p. 463-477.

21 UNODC: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, *Handbook on restorative justice programmes*, Vienna, Publishing and Library Section United Nations Office at Vienna, 2020.

22 European Forum for Restorative Justice, *Practice guide for RJ services. The victims' directive: Challenges and opportunities for restorative justice*, Leuven, European Forum for Restorative Justice, 2016, p. 10.; J. C. K. Kiyala, *Child soldiers and restorative justice: Participatory action research in the eastern Democratic Republic of Congo*, New York City, Springer International Publishing, p. 184-185; H. Zehr, *The little book of restorative justice*, New York City, Good Books.

23 Directives are EU-wide legislation, passed by the EU Parliament, that must be adapted or transposed to national legislation.

24 J. Mas Grau and O. Jubany, « De la révolution sexuelle à l'inclusion sociale des expressions LGBT+. Le processus d'obtention des droits LGBT en Espagne », *Droit et Cultures*, 77, 2019/1, p. 53-68; M. Baer, K. Majbroda and J. Radzuszewska, « Una legislation (in)utile? Les politiques urbaines et les expériences des LGBT à Wrocław », Pologne, *Droit et Cultures*, 77, 2019/, 2019, p. 69-88; E. Howard, « Protection des personnes LGBT+ en Europe: le cadre juridique national et de l'Union européenne », *Droit et Cultures*, 77, 2019/1, 2019, p. 21-36; J. A. Langarita Adiego, J. Mas Grau and O. Jubany, « Geografías de la diversidad sexogenérica más allá de la gran ciudad: experiencias, discursos y prácticas en dos ciudades medianas de Cataluña », *Documents d'Anàlisi Geogràfica*, 65, 3, 2019, p. 473-492.

25 C. Freeman, « Multiple methods beyond triangulation: Collage as a methodological framework in Geography », *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 102, 4, 2020, p. 328-340.

26 The research teams coded the interviews with letters for each country (BE for Belgium, B for Bulgaria, I for Italy, NL for the Netherlands, PL for Poland, ES for Spain), followed by a P in the case of professionals, and consecutive numbers.

27 W. C. Heffernan, *Rights and Wrongs: Rethinking the Foundations of Criminal Justice*, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.

28 N. Christie, « Conflicts as property », *The British Journal of Criminology*, 17, 1, 1977, p. 1-15.

29 L. Álvarez Suárez, « La mediación penal y su prohibición en supuestos de violencia de género: modelo español », *Revista Brasileira de Direito Processual Penal*, 5, 2, 2019, p. 1075-1106.

30 K. B. Rasmussen, « When is restorative justice? Exploring the implications of restorative processes in juvenile offence cases based on interviews and observations in Northern Ireland, Norway, and Orlando, Florida », in Anna Nylund, Kaijus Ervasti and Lin Adrian (Eds.), *Nordic mediation research*, New York City, Springer International Publishing, 2018, p. 145-179.

31 European Forum for Restorative Justice, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

32 See e.g. K. Daly, « What is restorative justice? Fresh answers to a vexed question », *Victims & Offenders*, 11, 1, 2016, p. 9-29.

33 L. Millington, « Using Restorative Justice in Cases of LGBTI Hate Crime (England and Wales) », in Alexi De Greef and Kelly Grossthal (Eds.) *Safe To Be Handbook*, Safe To Be by Speak Out project consortium, 2020, p.46-75.

34 Marc Forget, « Reconciliation: some lessons learned in the restorative justice context », *Conflictology*, 1, 2009, p. 46.

Pour citer cet article

Référence électronique

Ignacio Elpidio Domínguez Ruiz, Malin Roiha et Olga Jubany, « Restorative Justice and Anti-LGBT Hate Crimes: Experiences and Disparities from the Ground », *Droit et cultures* [En ligne], 86 | 2024/1, mis en ligne le 30 juin 2024, consulté le 16 octobre 2025. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/droitcultures/9543> ; DOI : <https://doi.org/10.4000/130dg>

Auteurs

Ignacio Elpidio Domínguez Ruiz

-  IDREF : <https://idref.fr/258389966>

Ignacio Elpidio Domínguez Ruiz is a social and cultural anthropologist specialised in queer studies, victimisation, and inequalities. His main areas of study are the victimisation of queer people, spatial inequalities, justice systems and institutions, and work in digital platforms. He is currently working as a professor at the Universidade de Santiago de Compostela. He is the author, among other publications, of *Bifobia: Etnografía de la Bisexualidad en el Activismo LGTB* and *Tú a Soria y Yo a Barcelona: o Cómo Cambian las Vidas Queer en Función de Dónde Vivamos*. He has also collaborated on *Más que Visibles: Antología de la Bisexualidad y Otras Plurisexualidades*. He has recently published: : (2023) *Tú a Soria, yo a Barcelona. O cómo cambian las vidas queer en función de dónde vivamos*. Barcelona-Madrid Egales ; Domínguez Ruiz, I. E.; Mancha-Cáceres, O. I.; Pichardo, J. I. (2023) *Returning to the gaybourhood: Expectations of resilience and recovery of Chueca (Madrid) after the COVID-19 pandemic*. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 35. ; Domínguez Ruiz, I. E. (2023) *La dimensión espacial de la victimización anti-LGBTI en España*. *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, 183, 21-38; Domínguez Ruiz, I. E.; Rué, A.; Jubany, O. (2023) *Police Resilience as a Multilevel Balance: Needs and Resources for Victim Support Officers*. *PoliceQuarterly*, 26(2), 213-244.

Malin Roiha

-  IDREF : <https://idref.fr/232712077>

**VI
AF**

- **VI AF** : <http://viaf.org/viaf/134154739837152991263>

Malin Roiha holds a PhD in Social Anthropology from the University of Barcelona and a degree in Social Anthropology and Gender Studies, as well as a Master's in Anthropology from Stockholm University. Her research focuses include hate speech, hate crimes, racism, LGBT-phobia, and access to justice. She currently works as a researcher at the European Social Research Unit in the Department of Social Anthropology at the University of Barcelona. In this role, she engages in research and transnational coordination of European projects focused on social issues, adopting an ethnographic and intersectional approach. Malin Roiha has recently published : Jubany, O., Klett-Davies, M., Roiha, M. (2022). Problematising the Victims' Rights Directive From the Ground: The Implementation of Victim Support Services in Greece, Italy, Bulgaria, Cyprus, and Spain. *European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice*; Domínguez Ruiz, I. E., Roiha, M. and Jubany, O. (2022). Restorative solutions for anti-LGBT victimisation experiences: potential pathways for victims' wellbeing and key challenges and needs. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*. Jubany, O., Más Grau, J. and Roiha, M. (2019). *From universal rights to individual protection: The application of the "Victims' Directive" across Europe*. SupportVoc co-funded by the European Union's Justice Programme. Jubany, O. and Roiha, M. (2018). *Las palabras son armas. Discurso de odio en la red*. Barcelona: Edicions UB.

Olga Jubany

-  IDREF : <https://idref.fr/232711909>

Dr Olga Jubany, a Full Professor at the University of Barcelona, has over two decades of anthropological research experience, including work at the London School of Economics and at the University of Barcelona. Her recent research focuses on pioneering ethnographic studies that explore identity, otherness, discrimination, and intersectionality, particularly in relation to social policies. Her work examines both, the implementation of public policies by state agents and the lived experiences of those affected, with a focus on critical issues such as migration, territorial inequalities, and access to justice. Currently, she coordinates the Horizon Europe-funded project EXIT (2022-2025), which addresses territorial inequalities from an intersectional perspective. Dr Jubany has served as the International Coordinator for more than ten large-scale European projects, collaborating extensively with civil society organizations and public institutions across Europe. Her research has led to significant academic contributions, including numerous books, chapters, and articles in high-impact journals, and is Series Editor, together with Saskia Sassen, of the Palgrave-Macmillan Collection Migration, Diasporas and Citizenship. Her career is rooted in applying ethnographic methods to understand global issues through a local lens, bridging the gap between scholarly research and social transformations. Her recent publications include: (2024) 'When will you go back to "real" police work?' The liminal nature of victim support police officers. *Police Practice and Research*; (2024) Superando la ambigüedad: métodos mixtos para el diseño de una encuesta de victimización queer. *Política Criminal*, 19(37), art. 14, p. 386-404; (2023) La "desresponsabilización" del Estado. Una mirada etnográfica a la externalización del asilo desde el sistema de recepción. *Migraciones*. Publicación del Instituto Universitario de Estudios sobre Migraciones, (58), p. 1-18; (2023) *Categorías desbordadas: cuestionando etiquetas, jerarquías y alteridades*. Barcelona: Bellaterra Edicions; (2023) Drawing a line: boundary work in victim support police work. *Policing and Society*; (2022) Problematising the Victims' Rights Directive From the Ground: The Implementation of Victim Support Services in Greece, Italy, Bulgaria, Cyprus, and Spain. *European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice*.

Articles du même auteur

Researching diverse understandings of justice and the potential of restorative measures for hate crimes [Texte intégral]

La recherche sur les différentes interprétations de la justice et sur le potentiel des mesures de réparation des crimes de haine [Texte intégral | traduction | fr]

Paru dans *Droit et cultures*, 86 | 2024/1

De la révolution sexuelle à l'inclusion sociale des expressions LGBTQ+. Le processus d'obtention des droits LGBTQ+ en Espagne [Texte intégral]

From Sexual Revolution to Social Inclusion of LGBTQ+ Expressions. The Process of Obtaining LGBTQ+ Rights in Spain

Paru dans *Droit et cultures*, 77 | 2019/1

Présentation [Texte intégral]

Une approche expérientielle, intersectionnelle et située de la diversité sexuelle et de genre

Paru dans *Droit et cultures*, 77 | 2019/1

Standing up to Intersectional Discrimination: a Multi-dimensional Approach to the Case of Spain [Texte intégral]

Faire face à la discrimination intersectionnelle : une approche multi-dimensionnelle du cas espagnol

Paru dans *Droit et cultures*, 62 | 2011-2

Droits d'auteur



Le texte seul est utilisable sous licence CC BY-NC-ND 4.0. Les autres éléments (illustrations, fichiers annexes importés) sont susceptibles d'être soumis à des autorisations d'usage spécifiques.