

Federal Probation

What Punishes? Inmates Rank the Severity of Prison vs. Intermediate Sanctions..... *Joan Petersilia
Elizabeth Piper Deschenes*

Using Day Reporting Centers as an Alternative to Jail..... *David W. Diggs
Stephen L. Pieper*

Locating Absconders: Results From a Randomized Field Experiment ... *Faye S. Taxman
James M. Byrne*

Rehabilitating Community Services Toward Restorative Service Sanctions in a Balanced Justice System..... *Gordon Bazemore
Dennis Maloney*

The Mirmont Evaluation: Drug Treatment as a Condition of Pretrial Release..... *Thomas J. Wolf*

An Analysis of Home Confinement as a Sanction *Stephen J. Rackmill*

Against Certain Offenders in the Labor Movement: A Study of 19 U.S.C. 504..... *Arthur L. Bowker*

The Ideology of Black Correctional Officers in Georgia..... *John A. Arthur*

The Military Atmosphere of Boot Camps..... *John P. Keenan
R. Barry Ruback
Judith G. Hadley*

Intensive Rehabilitation Supervision: The Next Step in Community Corrections..... *Paul Gendreau
Francis T. Cullen
James Bonta*

"The Law"—LSD Sentence Modifications Raise the Issue with §1B1.10 Procedure *Catharine M. Goodwin*

148328
148336

MARCH 1994

behavior of offenders (as well as impact on the community and victims) which build on strong emerging theoretical frameworks (see Braithewaite, 1989; Schneider, 1991; Bazemore, 1993b).⁹

Finally, not discussed in this article are obvious changes in staffing and resource allocation that must occur if probation and community corrections staff members are to be empowered to develop carefully designed projects to achieve restorative and rehabilitative objectives. Clearly, significant changes in traditional probation casework will be needed in order to relieve probation and community corrections staff of individual monitoring and caseload responsibilities associated with the case work model which currently limit opportunities for the kind of community ordered work needed to develop meaningful service projects (Bazemore, 1992). Adoption of the new paradigm and new mission, however, should at least provide a conceptual and value base for whatever changes are needed to make this transition. Future policy development in community corrections should critically review current use of community service and consider possible expansion of projects tied to clear performance objectives. While several conceptual frameworks provide a possible basis for assessing performance of community service interventions—and goals such as providing an incarceration alternative should be revisited—the restorative and competency development intervention paradigms should be carefully examined.

NOTES

¹The problem of multiple standards of success has also plagued other programs such as intensive supervision in which some have apparently viewed high violation rates as a positive outcome (Byrne, Lurigio, & Petersilia, 1992).

²At the same time, service projects could be designed so as to reinforce other critical community supervision objectives. It is important to clarify that community service as proposed here would *not* meet all possible objectives of sanctioning. This "all things to all people" approach has in fact been part of the problem. In fact, a restorative community service would not, by definition, be designed to meet retributive objectives and would discourage use of service for this purpose.

³Though many of the examples and underlying theoretical arguments we present for community service draw on examples from juvenile justice and refer to offenders as youth, we believe that the hypothesized restorative and rehabilitative potential of community service should apply equally to young adult offenders. The neglect of these arguments in implementing community service in adult corrections seems if anything more pronounced than in juvenile justice.

⁴The approach in this regard is similar to that being emphasized in some offender "boot camps" where work is sometimes required as punishment and degradation (Morash & Rucker, 1990).

⁵Moreover, deemphasizing punishment does not mean that service cannot be designed explicitly to accomplish public protection goals—or that only a minimum number of hours should be ordered. In fact, one reason service may not be accepted as

an alternative to incarceration is that the number of hours seems too low to compensate for the severity of the offense; community service in this case is viewed as "getting off easy" (McDonald, 1989). While low hour requirements are appropriate as long as service is viewed only as an add-on, artificial caps limit broader application as a viable alternative to incarceration as well as to other sanctions. Hillsman (1990) makes a similar case in explaining the sparse use of day fines in the U.S. compared with Europe.

⁶Many of the positive and negative conclusions in this section are based on the author's observation of community service programs while director of the Restitution Education and Specialized Technical Assistance and Training (RESTTA) program and the second author's experience as a technical assistance provider for this program. These observations also uncovered clear exceptions to the norm of mundane and punitive application of community service rule in both juvenile and some adult courts and community corrections departments. Genesee County, New York, and Quincy, Massachusetts, are among several pockets of exemplary practice in adult corrections. Charleston, South Carolina; Dallas, Texas; Denver, Colorado; Dakota County, Minnesota; and Bend, Oregon, provide examples of creative and well-managed juvenile justice community service programs (Rubin, 1986; Schneider, 1985; Bazemore, 1991).

⁷The offender also is "held accountable" in an important sense by taking responsibility for directly making amends for the loss or harm from the offense. Such accountability is clearly different from the "accountability" achieved by confinement, electronic monitoring, or urine screens.

⁸In terms of an overall Balanced Approach, it is also important to note that the community protection objective can be effectively addressed by ensuring that community service is a structured, closely supervised experience designed to reduce the likelihood that the offender has either time or opportunities for delinquent behavior (Klein, 1988). Though many options are available, and community service should not depend on one modality, one of the most effective means of achieving consistent and rigorous supervision is through the work crew format. This format is also the most cost effective, and crews can be mobilized for various types of work during weekend and evening hours.

⁹In the case of restorative justice, an emerging theoretical base and body of research is supportive of the view that the experience of making amends for harm done to the community through unpaid service may have rehabilitative impact (Eglish, 1975; Schneider, 1991; Wright, 1991). One clear basis for this expectation is derived from the equity theory idea that individuals in social and political situations tend toward fairness and balance (Schneider, 1991). A sanction calling for proportionate repayment to victims and the community might, all other things being equal, be more often viewed as fair than other sanctions—especially those that may stigmatize the offender (Braithewaite, 1989; Walgrave, 1993). Schneider's (1991) research in particular tends to support this expected impact of community service and restitution and also found service was related to a greater sense of citizenship (as reflected in self-images as a good, honest, law-abiding person) and a greater likelihood to express remorse. These in turn decreased the likelihood of reoffending. Competency development, on the other hand, draws on several theoretical traditions and disciplines including various statements of control theory (Hirschi, 1969; Polk & Kobrin, 1972), the labeling perspective (Becker, 1960; Schur, 1973), as well as developmental psychology (e.g., Erickson, 1968) and social learning approaches (Elliott, Huizinga & Ageton, 1985).

REFERENCES

Armstrong, T., Maloney, D., & Romig, D. (1990, Winter). The balanced approach in juvenile probation: Principles, issues and application. *Perspectives*.

- Bazemore, G. (1993a). *Balanced and restorative justice for juvenile offenders: An overview of a new OJJDP initiative* (Monograph). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Bazemore, G. (1993b). Designed work experience as an alternative intervention for juvenile offenders. *The Justice Professional*, 7(2), 47-68.
- Bazemore, G. (1992). On mission statements and reform in juvenile justice: The case of the balanced approach. *Federal Probation*, 56(3), 64-70.
- Bazemore, G. (1991). New concepts and alternative practice in community supervision of juvenile offenders: Rediscovering work experience and competency development. *Journal of Crime & Justice*, 14(1), 27-52.
- Bazemore, G., West, B., LoValvo, M., Remer, L., & Wright, C. (1992). *Accountability in dispositions for juvenile drug offenders* (Monograph). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance.
- Becker, H. (1960). *Studies in sociology of deviance*. New York: Free Press.
- Beha, J., Carlson, K., & Rosenblum, R. (1977). *Sentencing to community service*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Bird, T., Beville, S.L., Carlson, O., & Johnson, G. (1978). *A design for youth development policy* (Monograph). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
- Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame and reintegration*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Butts, J., & Snyder H. (1991). *Restitution and juvenile recidivism* (Monograph). Pittsburgh, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice.
- Byrne, J., Lurigio, A., & Petersilia, J. (1992). *Smart sentencing: The emergence of intermediate sanctions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Danzig, R., & Szanton, P. (1987). *National service: What would it mean?* Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Doleshal, E. (1982). The dangers of criminal justice reform. *Criminal Justice Abstracts*, 14, 135.
- Eglish, A. (1975). Beyond restitution: Creative restitution. In J. Hudson & B. Galaway (Eds.), *Restitution and criminal justice* (pp. 91-101). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Elliott, D.S., Huizinga, D., & Ageton, S. (1985). *Explaining delinquency and drug use*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Erickson, E. (1968). *Childhood and society*. New York: W.E. Norton.
- Freedman, M., Harvey, C.A., & Venture-Merkel, C. (1992). *The quiet revolution: Elder service and youth development in an aging society*. Washington, DC: Task Force on Youth Development and Community Programs, Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development.
- Galaway, B., & Hudson, J. (Eds.). (1990). *Criminal justice, restitution and reconciliation*. Massey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.
- Harland, A. (1980). Court ordered community service in criminal law: The continuing tyranny of benevolence? *Buffalo Law Review*, 29, 428-429.
- Harland, A., & Rosen, C. (1991). Impediments to the recovery of restitution by crime victims. *Violence and Victims*, 5(2), 127-140.
- Harris, M.K. (1984). Rethinking probation in the context of the justice model. In P.D. McAnany, D. Thomson, & D. Fogel (Eds.), *Probation and justice: Reconsideration of mission* (pp. 15-27). Cambridge, MA: Oelgeschlager, Gunn and Hain.
- Hillsman, S.T. (1990). Fines and day fines. In M. Tonry and N. Morris (Eds.), *Crime and justice: A review of research* (Vol. 12). Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *The causes of delinquency*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Home Office. (1970). *Non-custodial and semi-custodial penalties*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office (para. 33).
- Hudson, J., Galaway, B., & Novak, S. (1980). *The national assessment of adult restitution: The final report*. Duluth, MN: School of Social Development, University of Minnesota.
- Klein, A. (1988). *Alternative sentencing: A practitioners guide*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Company.
- Klein, A. (1982). *The theater connection* (Training Manual for a Court Employment and Training Program, Governors Youth Grant). Quincy, MA: Quincy District Court.
- Klein, A. (1980). *Earn it: The story so far*. Quincy, MA: Citizens for Better Community Courts, Inc.
- Krajick, K. (1982). Community service: The work ethic approach to punishment. *Corrections*, 8(5).
- Langton, S., & Miller, F. (1988). *Youth community service: A new era for America's ethos of community service* (Monograph). Massachusetts: Institute for Responsive Education.
- Maloney, D. (1991). *Community service on its highest plane*. Paper presented at OJJDP National Symposium on Restitution, Washington, DC.
- Maloney, D., Romig, D., & Armstrong, T. (1988). *Juvenile probation: The balanced approach*. Reno NV: National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.
- McDonald, D.C. (1989). *Restitution and community service*. (Monograph). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.
- McDonald, D.C. (1986). *Punishment without walls*. London: Rutgers University Press.
- Morash, M., & Rucker, L. (1990). A critical look at the idea of boot camp as a correctional reform. *Crime and Delinquency*, 36(2), 204-222.
- Newton, A. (1979). Sentencing to community service and restitution. *Criminal Justice Abstracts*, 11.
- Packer, H. (1968). *The limits of the criminal sanction*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Pease, K. (1985). Community service orders. In M. Tonry & N. Morris (Eds.), *Crime and justice: An annual review of research* (Vol. 6). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Polk, K., & Kobrin, S. (1972). *Delinquency prevention through youth development*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
- Pranis, K. (1993). *Restorative justice: Back to the future in criminal justice*. Working paper, Minnesota Citizens Council, Minneapolis, MN.
- Rolzinski, C. A. (1990). *Adventure of adolescence: Middle school students and community service*. Washington, DC: Youth Service America.
- Romig, D. (1984). *Justice for our children*. Austin, TX: Human Science Press.
- Rubin, T. (1994, December/January). Let's do more with monetary restitution and community work service. *Community Corrections Report*, 9-16.
- Rubin, T. (1986). Community service restitution by juveniles: Also in need of guidance. *Juvenile and Family Court Judges*, 37(1).
- Schiff, M. (1992). *Gauging the intensity of traditional and intermediate punishments: Developing the criminal penalty severity scale*. Unpublished monograph, Office of the Deputy Mayor for Public Safety, New York City, NY.
- Schneider, A. (1990). *Deterrence and juvenile crime: Results from a national policy experiment*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Schneider, A. (1985). *Guide to juvenile restitution*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Schneider, P.R. (1991, December). *National Restitution Program program survey*. Presentation to Juvenile Restitution, OJJDP, Washington, DC.
- Schine, J. (1989). *Young adolescents and community service*. Working paper, Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development.
- Schur, E.M. (1973). *Radical non-intervention: Rethinking the delinquency problem*. Englewood, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Shapiro, C. (1990). Is restitution legislation the chameleon of the victims' movement. In B. Galaway and J. Hudson (Eds.), *Criminal justice, restitution, and reconciliation*. Monsey, NY: Willow Tree Press.
- Umbreit, M., & Coates, R. (1993). Cross-site analysis of victim offender mediation in four states. *Crime and Delinquency*, 39(4).
- Umbreit, M. (1993). *Accountability and restorative justice as an intervention paradigm in a balanced juvenile justice system*.

- Working paper, College of Urban and Public Affairs, Florida Atlantic University.
- Umbreit, M. (1991). Mediation of youth conflict: A multi-system perspective. *Child and Adolescent Social Work*, 8(2).
- Van Ness, D.W. (1990). Restorative justice. In B. Galaway and J. Hudson (Eds.), *Criminal justice, restitution, and reconciliation*. Monsey, NY: Willow Tree Press.
- Walgrave, L. (1993, August). *Beyond retribution and rehabilitation: Restoration as the dominant paradigm in judicial intervention against (juvenile) crime?* Paper presented at the International Congress on Criminology Conference, Budapest, Hungary.
- Werner, E. (1989, April). Children of the garden island. *Scientific American*, 106-111.
- Wright, M. (1991). *Justice for victims and offenders*. Buckingham: Open University.
- Zehr, H. (1990). *Changing lenses: A new focus for crime and justice*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press.