Correcting Community Service: From Work Crews to Community Work in a Juvenile Court

William R. Wood

5

In 2001, the Clark County Juvenile Court in Washington State implemented the use of "restorative community service" (RCS) as part of its larger adoption of a restorative justice framework. This paper explores the court's implementation and use of RCS, including: (1) the types of institutional changes made by the court in its development of RCS, (2) the types and qualities of social interactions observed by the researcher through participant observation at several RCS sites, (3) the practical implications of these findings for proponents of restorative justice in the use of community service in youth settings, and (4) the theoretical implications of these findings for sociological and criminological research on community service.

Keywords community service; restorative community service; restorative justice; juvenile justice interventions

10

15

Introduction

20

Community service orders are sanctions that require offenders to work (usually unpaid) for a specified number of hours for governmental or non-profit agencies (Morris & Tonry, 1991; Pease, 1985). In the four decades since their initial use as an alternative program for adult traffic offenders in California, community service orders (referred to here as "community service") have become one of the most frequently used sanctions in both juvenile and adult justice (Bazemore & Maloney, 1994).

25

William R. Wood is a lecturer in sociology and criminology at the University of Auckland, New Zealand. He received his Ph.D. in sociology from Boston College in 2007. His research focuses on youth justice and crime, and alternatives to incarceration. Correspondence to: W.R. Wood, Department of Sociology, University of Auckland, 10 Symonds Street, Auckland 1010, New Zealand. E-mail: w.wood@auckland.ac.nz

Yet the commonality of community service throughout adult and juvenile courts in the United States belies the degree to which this type of sanction has appealed to varying and even contradictory justice logics (Harding, 1980). More than most sanctions, community service has been molded to mirror the philosophies of successive justice paradigms—as an alternative to incarceration in the 1960s and 1970s, as a means of rehabilitation and mechanism for job training throughout the 1970s and early 1980s, and increasingly since this time as an "intermediate" form of punishment. The effect, however, has been more than successive paradigm shifts in the design and logic of such programs. Rather, community service has increasingly become what Perrier and Pink (1985) have called "all things to all people," and its popularity in large part can be explained through what Harding (1980, p. 9) has identified as "protagonists from many different and sometimes conflicting philosophical perspectives."

Restorative justice is one theory of justice that has adopted and promoted the use of community service since the late 1970s. Restorative justice views crime less as a violation of criminal statutes and more as a type of "harm" or transgression of social relationships (Zehr, 1990). It argues that such harms can be best addressed through providing victims with opportunities to participate in their own cases and to voice harms directly to offenders; through providing opportunities for offenders to be accountable by making amends to those they have harmed; and through providing opportunities for community involvement in justice practices (Bazemore & Umbreit, 1995; Braithwaite, 1989; Zehr, 1990). While there is disagreement within restorative justice as to whether community service rightly fits these goals, and if so in what ways, advocates of its use have argued that it may serve as a potential "vehicle for restoration and reintegration" (Bazemore & Karp, 2004, p. 3), as a type of symbolic and/ or material making of amends to the community (Gerard, 1996; Karp, 2001), and as a means of community involvement and participation in justice work (Kurki, 2000).

Empirical research on the use of community service has most frequently focused on recidivism. Other research has included findings on areas such as program completion by offenders, hours of service provided to communities, or the monetary value of service work to municipalities. Yet research on what actually happens in these settings—how offenders and community members use and make sense of interventions, as well as how such setting are structured within the organizational goals of justice institutions—remains scarce (Bazemore, 2006; Bazemore & Maloney, 1994).

This paper seeks to add to research on these questions—how people use and make sense of community service, as well as how such service is structured—in terms of a case study of a juvenile court in Washington State that has abandoned more traditional forms of community service in lieu of what it calls "restorative community service" (RCS). Beginning in 2001, the Clark County Juvenile Court (CCJC) replaced its use of work crews with community projects that placed youth within existing community organizations and

required members of these organizations to work directly alongside youth. The court's use of the term "restorative community service" reflected more broadly not only changes to its use of community service, but also its adoption of Victim Offender Mediation (VOM), Community Accountability Boards (CAB), and other restorative approaches in a manner that sought to coordinate and systematically integrate these programs and interventions with its use of RCS.

Following discussion of the literature and an overview of research methods, this paper looks first at the types of institutional changes made by the CCJC in its development of RCS, including the question of why the court moved away from its use of work crews and how it re-structured its use of youth service work. It moves then to an analysis of findings on the types of social interactions observed by the researcher at RCS sites, particularly the way in which both youth and volunteers "made sense" of their work within these settings. It follows with a discussion of these findings as they speak to the shift away from the "disciplinary tactics" common with community service settings, as well as to the court's use of "real work" within community settings in lieu of its previous use of work crews. The paper concludes with a discussion of the theoretical implications of findings.

Literature on Community Service

First used in Alameda County, California in the late 1960s, community service orders were intended to serve as an alternative for female traffic violators who faced jail time resulting from a failure to pay their fines. Tonry and Lynch (1996, p. 125) note that this program received "widespread interest" and was influential in the establishment of similar programs in the United States and abroad. By the mid-1990s, the use of community service had become so common that, according to Bazemore and Maloney (1994, p. 24) most adult and juvenile courts in the US "had some experience with community service sanctions."

Public support for community service in the United States has remained strong over time (Moon, Sundt, Cullen, & Wright, 2000; Pranis & Umbreit, 1992; Schwartz, 1992). While support for its use remains popular however, particularly for youth offenders, the purpose and goals of community service have frequently been adapted to meet changing justice philosophies (Bazemore & Maloney, 1994). Throughout the 1970s and early 1980s, community service programs were implemented as a cost-effective alternative to incarceration (Cooper & West, 1981; Harris, 1984; Newton, 1979) and a means by which to potentially rehabilitative offenders (Eglash, 1977; McDonald, 1988; Rubin, 1986; Schneider, 1985). Krajick (1982) notes that between 1978 and 1981 the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) gave over 30 million dollars, distributed to some 85 jurisdictions, to establish community service programs in support of these aims.

Throughout the 1980s, support from policy-makers for community service as an alternative to incarceration and means of rehabilitation waned. Funding from the LEAA and other organizations was discontinued, as research on the use of sanctions that were seen as an alternative to incarceration—intensive probation, restitution, and community service—found only small or no net reductions of recidivism, and also found cases that resulted in "net-widening" of offenders (Tonry & Lynch, 1996). Policy-makers largely abandoned the idea that such programs could be used as an alternative to incarceration (Bazemore, 2006), and within the growing "tough on crime" discourse that predominated crime control policy and legislation in the 1980s, the lack of effectiveness in terms of recidivism reduction was largely seen indicative of failure.

On the other hand, the use of community service orders remained popular, if less as a means of rehabilitation or alternative to incarceration, then more as one of the growing number of "intermediate sanctions" that emerged in the 1980s (Caputo, 1999; McIvor, 1992).[1] Such sanctions—including community service—reflected both the "tough on crime" turn in criminal and juvenile justice, as well as the growing use of punitive sanctions by courts that fell in between probation and incarceration (Bazemore & Maloney, 1994; Kahan, 1998; Morris & Tonry, 1991; Perrier & Pink, 1985; Tonry & Lynch, 1996). The purpose of community service itself was marginally reframed as one of punishment or deterrence (Bazemore & Karp, 2004; Pease, 1982), and while such programs continued to expand, they were also eclipsed by both the massive growth in incarceration as well as the increasing popularity of other intermediate sanctions (Tonry & Lynch, 1996).

Research on Community Service

Beyond these general trends however, it is difficult to make definitive claims about the overall state of community service in adult or juvenile justice in the United States. Tonry and Lynch (1996) noted 15 years ago that no comprehensive research had been undertaken on the overall quality and nature of such programs, and to date there has still been no comprehensive study on the frequency, quality, or participation in community service work in the United States. Rather, the research that exists both within the US and internationally suggests a wide variation in the use of community service—in the types of programs used, the way they are implemented, the work that is required, and the duration of service obligations.

1. Caputo (2004, p. 11) defines intermediate sanctions as the "range of punishment options between probation and imprisonment. These programs are also referred to as intermediate penalties and intermediate punishments. The principal forms of intermediate sanctions include: intensive supervision programs (ISP); boot camps; day reporting centers; home confinement (with or without electronic monitoring); monetary penalties (fines and restitution); compulsory labor in the form of community service; and halfway houses."

Community service outcomes   5

A substantial amount of research exists on the recidivism effects of community service for both adult and youth offenders. Overwhelmingly, research has found either a small reduction or no net effect on recidivism in the use of community service (Bazemore, 2006; Bazemore & Karp, 2004; Butts & Snyder, 1992; Jengeleski & Richwine, 1987; Killias, Aebi, & Ribeaud, 2000; McDonald,   10 1986; Nirel, Landau, Sebba, & Sagiv, 1997; Tonry, 1997).

Community service programs have been assessed in dimensions other than recidivism, including individual indicators such as rates of completion, as well as community indicators such as total hours and/or monetary value of service work. Perhaps the most well-known study of community service in the US was   15 McDonald's (1986) research on the Vera Institute service program in New York City, which found that community service did not increase recidivism, functioned to successfully divert offenders from prison, and provided substantial cost-savings to the city in the form of reduced costs and over 60,000 hours of free labor in 1984 alone. Hudson, Galaway, and Novack's (1980) research on 20   20 adult community service programs within the US found that both offenders and victims believed the requirements of such programs to be "fair," and offenders who completed the programs by and large viewed their experience as "useful." Maloney and Holcomb's (2001) research on use of youth restorative community service in Deschutes County, Oregon found that this program effectively   25 replaced "busywork" with projects that serve immediate community needs such as the building of low-income housing, and these projects were supported through both time and money from community volunteers and organizations. Karp's (2002) study of agencies used by Vermont Reparative Probationers found high rates of program completion (91%) and high rates of agency satis-   30 faction (94%).

Outside the US, research by McIvor (1992) and Leibrich, Galaway, and Underhill (1986) found a high level of offender satisfaction with service work in Scotland and New Zealand, respectively. McIvor's (1992) work also made an important link between reduced recidivism and offender satisfaction with ser-   35 vice assignments—noteworthy insofar as it suggests that how offenders perceive the quality and purpose of such work matters. Further, research by Doob and McFarland (1984) identified community service programs where youth offenders continued working relationships with their service agencies after their service orders were completed, with some moving into paid work at   40 these organizations.

As important as these studies are in ascertaining the outcomes of community service programs, there remains what Bazemore and Maloney (1994, p. 27) identified 15 years ago a "lack of descriptive studies which distinguish *quality* and *focus* of community service." Outcomes such as "hours completed may be   45 viewed as a weak if convenient indicator of the value of service projects" argue Bazemore and Karp (2004, p. 8), and according to a more recent article by Bazemore (2006, p. 37) there still remains an identified need for research

into "the types of projects completed and the kinds of ongoing work being done that meets human needs...".

Community service and restorative justice

Within restorative justice, the use of community service has gained substantial, although hardly unanimous support. Since the 1970s, those who have seen community service as a possible addition to or part of restorative justice have focused on the use of service in terms of potentially reintegrating offenders into their communities (Bazemore & Karp, 2004; Braithwaite & Mugford, 1994); on the use of service as "symbolic" or in some cases literal restitution to the community (Eglash, 1977; Gerard, 1996; Hudson, Galaway, & Novack, 1980; Karp, 2001) and on community involvement in justice work and the forging of interactions between community members and offenders (Kurki, 2000).

Definitions of "restorative justice" vary markedly, however, as do considerations of what constitutes "restorative" practices. Johnstone and Van Ness (2007, p. 6) have argued that there is currently a lack of any "single clear and established meaning" of the concept of restorative justice. London (2006, p. 401) moreover has noted the degree to which research on restorative justice is frequently beset by an "ideological character of discourse concerning [what constitutes] restorative justice." The research presented in this article does not seek to identify what rightly constitutes "restorative justice." Rather, the primary focus of this research is on describing why and how this particular court transformed its use of community service, and analyzing the effects of these changes for participants within the community service setting.

Nevertheless, it is equally the case that the CCJC chose the term "restorative community service," and that the use of this term itself is not uncontroversial.[2] Some advocates of restorative justice see the use of community service as potentially beneficial to and generally consistent with the goals of restorative justice to the degree that it may complement larger strategies of repairing harms to victims and holding offenders accountable (Bazemore & Maloney, 1994; Crawford, 2002). Walgrave (1999, p. 131) in particular has argued that if restorative justice is to be developed into a "fully-fledged alternative intended to replace" current justice practices, it must address both the immediate harms caused to victims, as well as serve to restore the "public losses" (both material and otherwise) experienced by communities as a result of crime.

Others have been more critical of the use of community service in restorative justice, both in principle and in practice. The problem of justice organizations co-opting or "hijacking" community service and other restorative justice programs and interventions is a primary concern (Davis, 1992; Gavrielides, 2007).

2. One anonymous reviewer of an earlier draft of this article rightly noted that, "There is no consensus in the restorative justice literature on whether community sentencing is indeed part of the restorative justice practices."

Even those who support restorative justice have noted the problem of justice organizations simply re-labeling their programs as "restorative" (Wright, 1989; Zehr, 2007). Others have argued more generally that, whatever the possible benefits of service for offenders and communities, such programs fall outside of the scope of restorative justice work (McCold, 2004; Shapland, 2003). McCold (2004, p. 25) in particular has argued that regardless of the benefits to offenders or communities as a result of such work, "Unless each offender, his or her victims, and others they have harmed are given an opportunity to participate directly in the decision-making, it is not restorative justice."

Research and Methods

The research presented in this article is part of a larger three year case study on the use and effects of restorative justice interventions at the CCJC. The design of the overall study encompassed two areas of inquiry, namely research on the effects of the court's various restorative programs and interventions on victims, offenders, and community members; as well as research on the organizational changes made by the court in its adoption of a "restorative framework" between 1999 and 2005.

Research access was granted by the court to a variety of settings, interventions, and programs including VOMs, RCS, CABs, a restorative offender curriculum called Impact Competency Education (ICE), the court's Victim Impact Program (VIP), and probation and diversion meetings. Access was also granted to managerial meetings, court staff meetings, community outreach meetings, and other settings as necessary.

The principal research setting for this study was the community service site itself. At the CCJC, RCS sites were either one-time projects (community events, neighborhood clean-up projects, and so on), ongoing sites (community gardens, local libraries, etc.) or, in a small number of cases, county projects such as washing vehicles. Given the breadth of possible sites, RCS sites were chosen for observation in the attempt to cast as wide of a net as possible in terms of the variation of work performed by youth. Settings observed included a 4H community garden, a trail-building project, neighborhood park clean-ups, a local library, and community events projects. The proposal for research was authorized by the CCJC administrator, as well as by the researcher's Institutional Review Board.[3]

---

3. In settings where confidential and/or sensitive information was likely to occur (i.e. VOMs and probation or diversion meetings), participants not employed by the court were informed of the purpose of the research and provided the opportunity to be excluded. No participants requested to be excluded. On several occasions, however, the researcher was excluded by court staff for reasons either not provided by the staff at their discretion, or for reasons later explained to the researcher. Court staff were informed of the purpose and provided the opportunity to be excluded. No court staff requested to be excluded. In settings where confidential and/or sensitive information was not likely to exceed a level beyond that of "daily life" (i.e. casual or public settings such as community meetings or RCS sites), participants were not required to be informed.

Methods

This research utilized qualitative methodologies (interviews and participant observation) commonly employed in the study of organizations and criminal justice research that focuses on experiences, behaviors, and attitudes of participants within research settings.[4] Formal interviews (semi-structured) were conducted with the court administrator, four court managers, several probation staff,[5] two mediation and victim staff, and other select participants. The number of formal interviews was limited to 12, conducted largely in the beginning of the research, for the reason that they were no longer required or particularly beneficial once relationships had been established with court managers and staff. Formal interviews of court managers and the court administrator focused on the court's reasons for adopting RCS. Interviews of probation staff focused on the court's earlier use of community service, the transition to RCS, and their opinions as to use of RCS. Interviews with mediation staff focused on the use and effectiveness of RCS in VOMs and other restorative meetings.

Informal interviews (i.e. extended and usually impromptu discussions where the researcher was identified as such) were conducted with all of those listed above, as well as with community RCS volunteers, and representatives from community organizations (including those who supervised several RCS sites). The number of "informal interviews" and/or discussions numbered over 100, as the researcher was present at the court or peripheral sites more or less on a weekly basis for extended periods between 2003 and early 2006. Of particular importance were over a dozen extended conversations with the court's RCS coordinator—the individual most directly responsible for setting up the initial use of RCS sites and administering the growth of this program. Other informal interviews included at least 10 extended discussions with the court's restorative manager regarding the implementation and use of RCS; and over 30 discussions with RCS volunteers and site supervisors.

Participant observation included volunteer "work" at 13 RCS sites (several were attended by the researcher more than once). In the capacity of

4. The appropriateness of qualitative methods in investigating these types of questions has been well established. Creswell (2003, p. 181) notes that qualitative research is "emergent rather than tightly prefigured," and is thus appropriate for exploratory research where less is known about a social phenomena or the setting itself. Neuman (2000, p. 146) argues that qualitative methods are vital for research into lived settings insofar as they "emphasize the importance of social context for understanding the social world." In allowing for the role of social context, qualitative research considers "what came before [the study] or what surrounds the focus of the study. It also implies that the same events or behaviors can have different meanings in different cultures or historical eras" (Neuman, 2000, p. 146). Finally, qualitative methods are necessary for interpretative studies of social action. Often, researchers want to understand not only what happens in relation to frequency or patterns of social action, but also the meanings attached to social action by actors themselves (Weber, 1975).

5. Some probation staff worked largely with youth sex offenders and/or youth with specific mental health needs. These youth were excluded from the study and interviews with court staff involved in working with these offenders was not undertaken.

participant observer at RCS sites, the researcher was asked to adhere to the same CCJC guidelines as RCS volunteers. These guidelines included: (1) working in the same capacity as youth and other community volunteers, and (2) not inquiring into the nature of why other people were there at the site, and in particular *not* asking youth about the nature of their offense. These guidelines were firm insofar as the court had structured community service settings in a manner that sought to "mix" volunteers and offenders in a way that did not target or label youth offenders in particular (discussed in more detail below). Thus, it was not possible to both conduct research as a participant observer under the guidelines of the court, and simultaneously identify specific youth offenders for further interview research in these settings.

Non-participant observation included a variety of court meetings (staff meetings, managerial meetings, and meetings with other agencies), VOMs, other "restorative alternative" (RA) meetings, and community outreach meetings. Meetings between probation staff and offenders frequently included discussions of their experiences within RCS; and VOM or other restorative meetings frequently included discussions between victims and offenders regarding RCS.

Finally, this research included a large amount of data provided to the researcher by the court, including formal court documents such as protocols, mission statements, and best-practice guidelines; minutes and notes from court meetings and working groups; data (aggregate only) on offender completion rates for RCS, and volunteer participation numbers and total hours for RCS; and other various data.

Data Collection and Analysis

All primary data was collected via note-taking. In all cases except participant observation at RCS sites, notes were recorded as part of the interview and/or discussion process. At RCS sites, the researcher carried a small notebook to record observations, but in most cases where work was being performed or other group activities were conducted, notes were taken immediately following the conclusion of RCS work. Visible note-taking would have been disruptive to the research setting itself, and it was equally difficult or impossible for the researcher to extract himself with any regularity from the RCS setting. For these reasons, exact quotes from RCS sites are limited and as appear in this research only when there was no ambiguity as to their word-for-word veracity.

All primary data (i.e. interviews and notes from observations) collected by the researcher was converted into electronic format for use and analysis. A substantial amount data provided by the CCJC, including meeting minutes, written communications, planning documents, and so on were also converted into electronic format for coding and analysis. Data was coded to reflect categories regarding organizational changes and motives in the CCJC's adoption of RCS; experiences and attitudes of court staff regarding RCS;

expressed experiences and attitudes of RCS site organizers; and observations of the researcher on the social interactions, expressed attitudes, and behaviors among and between youth and volunteers at RCS sites. In this regard, this article presents data on two levels or units of analysis—the juvenile
5   court, including court managers and staff (organizational); and RCS sites (situational group settings). Data on the organizational level is presented below in relation to the reasons made by the court to implement RCS, and the means by which RCS was structured and implemented. Data on the level of RCS settings themselves is presented in the findings and subsequent discus-
10   sion section.

Limitations

The most immediate limitation to the study involves the degree to which findings from RCS sites observed by the researcher can be applied more generally to the CCJC's use of community service as a larger "unit of analysis." During
15   the course of this research, the court's use of community service in Clark County encompassed hundreds of sites and thousands of volunteers. Thus, there is a limit to the degree to which observations from specific RCS sites can be reliably applied to all RCS sites as used by the court over the period of study.[6]

20   ## Community Service in Clark County, Washington

Beginning in 2001, the CCJC implemented the use of what it calls "restorative community service" (RCS). Prior to this, the court had used a more traditional system of work crews for county and city projects such as picking up trash, beautification projects, and so on. These projects were usually supervised by a
25   court staff member.

The shift to RCS was related to several factors. In late 1999 the court started the use of (VOM) in a limited number of cases (although later its use of VOMs was expanded). This facilitated further interest and investigation by the court of other possible restorative programs and interventions, particularly
30   because it was recognized at the outset that most adjudications and diversions

6. This limitation was immediately clear to the researcher in the design of research, and attempts were made to mitigate this problem in two ways. Primarily, in the case of major problems such as fights or similar conflicts at sites not directly observed, such incidents were made known to the researcher by the RCS coordinator. Secondly, data from the experiences of youth at RCS sites not observed from the researcher was gathered from probation meetings with youth offenders who discussed their RCS work, and from other settings when possible. Also, RCS sites were chosen by the researcher, not the court. The court readily allowed access to any RCS site, and no attempt was made on the part of the court to influence the choice of these sites. Regardless, given the overall number of RCS sites and youth and volunteer participants at the CCJC, the findings here as they pertain to interactions, behaviors and expressed attitudes of youth offenders and volunteers must be limited to sites observed.

would not result in VOMs, even where the court was moving towards an increased use of this intervention. In 2001, for example, VOMs were used only in about 5 percent of juvenile cases.

Secondarily, the restructuring of community service was motivated by the emphasis on "community" within the court's adoption of a restorative justice philosophy. Community members in Clark County were at that time not involved in any type of interactions with youth offenders in such work. Rather, youth were usually kept at a distance from community members and organizations, and conversely these groups and individuals were afforded little means by which to be involved in such work.

Thirdly, court managers and probation staff recognized that community service work sometimes turned into "busywork," with no apparent logic other than to find something for youth to do. Interviews and conversations with probation staff also suggested that at times this type of work resulted in problems at community service projects in terms of conflicts between youth, and between youth and court staff. This was a problem the probation staff at the court called "fronting," which they took to mean the problem of "fronting an attitude" towards other youth and particularly towards court supervisors at community service sites.

A fourth factor identified by the court involved concern over community perception of work crews. Interviews with the court administer and two court managers reflected a belief that community service, as then employed, potentially painted a picture of these youth as "criminals." The court administrator and one court manager also expressed on different occasions the idea that most youth who were adjudicated or diverted to community service were not much different than other youth in Clark County, since the disposition guidelines for youth offenders in Washington State meant that most serious or repeat youth offenders were adjudicated to the state's Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration (JRA). Thus, the incongruity between the relatively minor offenses of most youth assigned to community service and the perceived criminality of these youth on the part of the community was a central concern. Signifying items such as orange vests and county vehicles that easily identified youth offenders were thought to only enhance this perception on the part of the community.

Finally, the introduction of RCS represented a deliberate decision on the part of the court administrator to "bring restorative justice into the workings of the court itself." The presumption of the court administrator and managers was that a separate restorative justice program (i.e. the use of mediation in only a small number of overall cases) would risk creating a bifurcated type of justice, whereby some youth and victims would be afforded participation in restorative programs and interventions, and others would not.[7] Also, the

7. While the CCJC initially used VOMs in a limited number of cases, it eventually moved to the use of a "Victim Impact Program" that contacted all victims of juvenile crime and offered a range of significant services, including the option of VOMs.

court administrator expressed on several occasions his concern that creating a separate "restorative justice program" would leave such programs vulnerable to future budgetary cuts, potentially create bureaucratic and cultural divisions in the court between restorative justice work and other more "traditional" court work, and would risk sending a message to the community that restorative justice constituted a separate (and thus less important) type of justice.

Conceptualizing Restorative Community Service

The court's decision to do away with work crews and use existing community organizations involved not only a change of venue, but a change in the structuring of service work itself. The court was able to make changes in community service with relatively minor difficulties for two reasons. Firstly, in Washington State, juvenile courts are chartered with coordinating and supervising community service work for youth offenders under the auspices of "local sanctions." Washington is the only state to use a comprehensive determinate sentencing scheme for all youth offenders, and while more serious or chronic offenders are adjudicated to JRA, the large majority of youth offenders are adjudicated or diverted to "local sanctions," which may include detention, community supervision, restitution, community service, and other programs and interventions—all overseen and administered by the local juvenile court.[8]

Secondly, in Washington State, juvenile courts are overseen by county Superior Court judges. In the case of the CCJC, the court administrator had longstanding positive work relationship with the Superior Court as a juvenile court manager and administrator. His ability to draw upon this social and institutional capital was, in his own words, "instrumental" in convincing the Superior Court judges to agree to these changes with little opposition.[9]

In conceptualizing the implementation of RCS, the court proposed several changes to its then existing use of service work. The primary difference was abandoning the use of work crews in favor of developing service sites within existing community groups and organizations. By 2001, the court had approached several non-profit community organizations that in turn agreed to serve as RCS sites. In identifying these sites, the court employed what its administrator called a "value-added" approach—namely the idea that community organizations could benefit from the addition of youth offenders in terms of increased capacity, as well as in terms of identifying "acute community needs" not currently being met in the county. However, the court also asked

8. For information on Washington State's use of determinate sentencing, see Lieb and Brown (1999).
9. For further discussion of the CCJC administrator's role in implementing restorative justice at the CCJC, see Rowe (2002).

that community partner organizations adhere to a set of guidelines. Primarily, the court asked community organizations wanting to participate in RCS to provide volunteers to work alongside youth. Also, with the exception of skilled labor or liabilities (mostly power tools, vehicles, and hazardous materials), the court asked that community volunteers do the same work as youth, and not to distinguish between types of work done by youth and by community members themselves.

Another guideline in the implementation of RCS was that community organizations were asked to show that their work had some "tangible benefit" to the Clark County community, as well as to the youth themselves. For-profit agencies were generally not allowed to participate in community service, except in certain circumstances where they were funding or participating in non-profit community work. Also, while other governmental agencies were sometimes used as community service sites, these sites were nevertheless required to meet the first criteria, namely that youth work alongside members of these agencies and volunteers, not simply for them.[10] For example, the 4H Club maintained a community garden in conjunction with Washington State University. Youth were allowed to do service work at the garden—planting, mulching, weeding, harvesting, etc.—and this work was done alongside community volunteers and paid staff from 4H.

Finally, in the implementation of RCS, the court generally set the upper limit of service for youth offenders at 24 hours. This decision was based on the idea that "quality" and not "quantity" would better serve the goal of having youth interact with and work alongside community members. On the other hand, community service was one of the most common requirements of diverted and adjudicated youth, and over the course of this research it was uncommon to see a youth that did not receive some type of service requirement (except in a small number of cases when youth were allowed to substitute direct work for victims in lieu of RCS as a result of a VOM agreement, or when behavioral or mental health problems made service work difficult or impossible).

Between 2000 and 2004, the number of community service sites grew from a dozen or so to hundreds. Some sites were one-time projects, and others were ongoing, particularly within community organizations such as local libraries, the local Humane Society, and so on. In 2004, the court recorded approximately 26,000 community service hours, and over 10,000 volunteer hours by community volunteers working with youth. In this same year, the court placed approximately 1,000 out of a total of about 1800 adjudicated or diverted youth into

10. On numerous occasions, youth did work for governmental agencies in a different capacity, as part of their restitution. In these cases, youth that had damaged public property were allowed to work directly for the agencies that had suffered these losses—schools, transit, etc. This work was however, not part of RCS, but was rather part of an agreement made (usually in a VOM) between the agency and the youth.

community service projects.[11] By 2005, the court was recording, on average, an 80% completion rate for community service requirements.

Findings

Community Service Settings

RCS sites and the types of worked performed at these sites varied tremendously. In any given week, there was a variety of RCS sites to choose from, usually at least six. As almost all sites were "elective," one might assume that most youth chose "easy work" such as libraries, food banks, and other similar sites, but in fact some of the more popular sites in terms of participation were those that did dirty or more physical work, including the community garden, trail building, etc. As explained above, the researcher was not able to interview specific youth at these sites, so the question of why some youth willingly took on more demanding assignments remains unanswered. However, this fact also seemed to dispel the idea that youth were opposed to more physical or strenuous labor when given the choice to do otherwise.

Although differences in the type of work being performed did not seem to matter substantially to most youth, there were in fact some significant differences between sites themselves. One-time sites (i.e. sites that met only once such as neighborhood clean-ups), after-school or partial day sites, and repeating full-day sites varied insofar as the latter two were frequently tighter and more predictable in terms of the establishment of work roles and responsibilities, as well as in terms of the overall flow of the workday. On the other hand, one-time sites were often more festive (sometimes literally, as in the case of community events) and more spontaneous in terms of the type of interactions and the outcomes of work between volunteers and youth.

There were simple reasons for these differences. Primarily, ongoing sites were usually staffed by site supervisors, and often had repeat community volunteers. Many of these sites were pre-existing volunteer organizations or community projects, and were simply adapted as needed to include youth

---

11. In 2004, the CCJC had 3,043 total cases referred for prosecution. Out of these, 1,088 resulted in adjudication to "local sanctions" and 990 resulted in diversion (with the rest being dismissed, remanded, or adjudicated to JRA), for a total of approximately 2,080 cases that could have potentially resulted in community service. However, the state's data system tracks individual cases more easily than individual offenders. As the state's report (Governor's Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee, 2005, p. 176) notes, "A juvenile may be involved in more than one case within a year depending on the number of times the juvenile offends. A case may involve more than one charge/offense depending on the circumstances of the event and the decision of the prosecutor. Juveniles who commit minor/first offenses may be offered diversion instead of being taken to court. Juveniles who do not complete a diversion agreement, refuse diversion or are refused diversion are charged in juvenile court. Thus, the number of 2,080 is misleading in terms of the number of total referrals vs. the number of actual offenders. The CCJC's data put the number of individual adjudicated or diverted offenders in 2004 at about 1,780. In these cases, approximately 70% of the total adjudicated or diverted offenders in 2004 performed some community service.

"volunteers" from the court. Thus, there was already a fairly established structure to the workday and the expectations of volunteers—a structure that by and large youth offenders moved into with few major problems.

At one-time sites, this structure was somewhat less perceptible. At many of these sites, volunteers had not worked with the court before, and were themselves unfamiliar with what was "supposed to happen." This usually led to spending more time developing roles, and less time actually working. In many situations this was not a bad thing, such as when youth would take leadership roles in work they were familiar with, or when volunteers and youth would spend substantial time interacting with one another socially. In a smaller number of cases, however, this led to a fairly quick grouping of "volunteers" and "offenders," where idle time and chatter made it both easy and comfortable for both groups to distinguish between each other.

Interactions

By and large, RCS sites were quotidian places; unremarkable to the degree that much community volunteerism transpires without notice or accolade. Quotidian does not mean unimportant however; indeed given the high rate of community volunteerism with RCS in Clark County it seems clear that many people in Clark County placed great emphasis on community involvement. Rather, what is meant is that, almost without exception, people mostly showed up and worked, took breaks or lunches, worked some more and then went home. There were no serious conflicts (i.e. physical confrontations or threatening verbal confrontations) at the observed sites, either between youth or with volunteers.

Thus, interactions themselves tended to be also unremarkable—again, not unimportant, but routine to the degree that they were centered around the work being done at particular RCS sites. In this respect, many of the conversations between and among participants were based on the work itself: questions as to how to perform certain tasks, why work was performed in the manner it was, etc. Sometimes, particularly when people were grouped together on tasks, there would be side conversations about various things—music, movies, and sports were common. Less frequently, youth talked about why they were there, but volunteers (having been asked not to inquire into why youth were present at service sites) were often reticent to push youth to talk about their offenses, and such conversations were generally more "exploratory" than overtly critical—framed largely along the lines of "Why do you think you did this?" or "What have you learned from this?" In a small number of cases, however, there was extended conversation between youth offenders and volunteers as to the offense in question, particularly when youth freely volunteered their reasons for being at RCS sites.

The predominant postures of volunteers in cases where offenses were discussed tended to be either inquisitive or sympathetic, or both. Sanctimony was

infrequent. Given the fact that these conversations were mostly occurring while people were working, there was usually a staccato to the give and take between youth and volunteers that focused on work, then drifted into deeper things, and then back to work again. It is difficult to explain the pace of such exchanges, other than to say that in a majority of settings it was the work itself that set the rhythm of interactions. Some settings allowed for more conversation, others less. Some jobs required youth to work alongside only one volunteer; others were completed in large groups. Differences in the types of work and tasks led to different paces and rhythms of conversations. But, particularly in ongoing sites, there was an underlying and somewhat predictable "structure" to the rhythm of these interactions.

This was evident, for example, in a smaller number of ongoing RCS sites where time was set aside specifically for conversation. The 4H garden, for example, which was set aside some time in the afternoons in order to discuss the primary purpose of the organization, namely to grow food for local food banks. In these conversations, food was brought in from the garden and eaten while all of those present were asked to reflect and discuss the role that food played in people's lives, how the garden functioned in the community, and so forth. In these conversations, and indeed in similar conversations in other RCS sites, youth were asked not to discuss their specific offenses, although they were free to discuss less tangible aspects of their involvement with the site such as what they had learned and how they might use this work to reflect on their lives. To be sure, youth at time *did* discuss their offenses, both in these group settings and at RCS sites in general. In such cases, by and large this was not treated as problematic, since the "rules" for not discussing offenses was meant to afford youth the opportunity to avoid having to declare why they were present at an RCS site. In cases where youth were bragging or telling tales regarding their offense, however, this was frequently curtailed by the site supervisor or by court mentors, when they were present.

Community volunteers did not regularly seek to establish positions of authority in RCS settings. Rather, the degree of "parallel participation" between youth and volunteers meant that hierarchies, which were certainly present, tended to form around the work itself. Site supervisors, who were not court staff, were always in charge, but beyond this there was a high degree of variability in terms of how work was performed and divided. Youth who had been at a site more than once often took leadership roles, and conversely volunteers who gave directions or guidance generally did so out of their knowledge of the work at hand. In most sites there were multiple adult volunteers present, so the tendency to defer to "the adult," in terms of work roles was mitigated somewhat in favor of a tendency to defer to those who had more knowledge. Often these people were adults, since they had skills that youth frequently lacked, but on several occasions these roles were reversed as youth demonstrated knowledge of various skills—particularly physical skills such as construction or mechanics.

Given that RCS sites were places where juvenile youth offenders performed their service work, significant attention was given to the question of how youth offenders might be pejoratively distinguished from volunteers in these settings. However, in observations of interactions between youth, volunteers, and site supervisors there was little overt "labeling" of youth offenders *as offenders*. There were numerous instances of adult volunteers chastising or criticizing young people for not pulling their share or for goofing off. There were also some instances where adult volunteers directly responded brusquely to statements by youth who volunteered information regarding their offenses, or to other opinions or statements proffered by young people regarding a variety of topics (especially the perceived stupidity of the work itself). Most of the time, however, perceived problems were dealt with by strategies designed to get people back to working. For example, in one instance at the community garden several young people had spotted some type of rodent, and had taken to chasing it down. The site supervisor then asked two or three of the more experienced adult volunteers to switch tasks, and to in turn choose "less experienced volunteers" (i.e. the youth busy chasing the rodent) to help them with these new tasks. Each youth was then told by the site supervisor that they had been given new tasks, and they went off to their new jobs. This occurred within five minutes or so after the youth had run off to find the rodent, with no conflict and minimal consternation.

In other cases where there were potential problems, interactions sometimes took on a nurturing role on the part of volunteers. Some individually adopted youth for specific tasks, and others brought youth aside to explain "how things worked." Again, part of this depended on the type of work and setting itself. At larger community events or sites that tended to draw a more mixed crowd of volunteers, especially where there were youth volunteers present, it was difficult to discern between volunteers and offenders. On two occasions observed by the researcher where numerous youth offenders and youth volunteers were simultaneously present, it was impossible to distinguish between the two. These occasions were larger community events, and while only two of these larger events were observed, there were dozens of such events within any given year—fishing derbies, sporting events, holiday events, community events, and so on.

Regardless of the ease by which youth could or could not be identified, the predominant attitude of community members towards youth (as reflected in both observations and informal interviews) seemed to be that they could care less why people were there as long as they did what they were supposed to do, namely work. The overwhelming attitude of community volunteers was that people, especially young people, make mistakes. On numerous occasions, and in numerous discussions, community volunteers noted that the addition of more "volunteers" was a good thing. Several volunteers recognized the capriciousness of a system that catches only a small number of offenders. They themselves had once "been young," as more than one volunteer noted.

Real Work

Over the course of this research there emerged a consistent (although hardly
ubiquitous) pattern of expressed attitudes on the part of youth offenders
towards RCS in terms of the nature of the work being performed. As discussed
above, in some settings youth offenders were not easily identified. For those
who were however (either through reference to their service obligation, to
their offense, etc.), such attitudes by and large intoned an acceptance of the
legitimacy of their service work. Indeed, prior to the commencing of this
research, the court had already recognized differences in youth attitudes as
compared to its previous use of work crews, and the court administrator and
RCS coordinator used the term "real work" to conceptually explain this
change. As a researcher, I was initially reticent to uncritically utilize the
court's language, but in the majority of observed RCS sites, the concept fit
well.

This sense of "real work" was less related to the type of work performed
than to the behaviors and comments made by youth in terms of what they per-
ceived to be the purpose and function of the work itself. Two factors seemed
to predicate youth perception of "real work," namely an assessment of why
they were doing the work they were doing (i.e. its purpose), and who was
actually doing the work. To be clear, offenders did not perceive this work as
anything less than punishment, and rightly so; indeed this type of work was
not "volunteering." It was, as all labor used in youth correctional settings,
coerced work. This is an important perspective, and one that repeatedly men-
tioned by youth themselves at both RCS sites as well as in probation meetings.
Youth who did not complete their service requirements would be "returned"
to the court for violation of probation or for failure to meet their diversion
agreement.

Nevertheless, youth also repeatedly evidenced respect towards both the
work they were asked to do, as well as towards community volunteers who
worked alongside them. This was evident in several ways. Primarily, while it
was common to see youth complain about having to work, it was decidedly less
frequent to hear complaints about the purpose or nature of the work itself.
Another way to think of this is to say that while youth clearly perceived their
"required" participation in such work as punishment, there was also a sense
articulated by many youth that such work also had some legitimate purpose or
end beyond their own punishment. This was clear not only in observed conver-
sations and interactions, but in the surprising return of a smaller number of
youth offenders who volunteered at sites after their service obligation was
completed. The 4H garden (mentioned above) was the first, but not only,
example of a youth returning to volunteer at a site after his work was com-
pleted. This young man had become quite interested in the garden, partly for
the reason that his own family relied on one of the food banks served by this
project. On the weekend following his completion of service, he returned to

volunteer. Other youth mentioned in probation meetings that they had stayed on to volunteer after their service work was completed. One female offender who worked at a local church, helping with catering and serving food, noted that she "liked RCS so much" that she had brought along a friend and her mother to help.   5

Over the course of this research there were several youth who were present at RCS sites as "volunteers" who had completed their required service. Given the overall small "sample" of observed RCS sites when contrasted to the hundreds of RCS sites in any given year, the number of youth that returned to volunteer must have been larger, although this data was not tracked by the   10
court, so it impossible to estimate how frequent this was.

"Real work" also seemed to matter in terms of youth attitudes towards community volunteers who worked alongside them at RCS sites. As community volunteers were present at RCS sites to work, and not to supervise, youth did not generally regard them as authority figures or as part of the social control   15
apparatus of the court itself. As noted above, this did not mean there were not minor conflicts or disagreements between youth and volunteers, there were. Nor did this mean that volunteers never acted in ways that sought to appropriate the authority of the court or in other less than cordial ways. Rather, to the degree that the behaviors and expressed attitudes of youth can   20
be inferred, respect towards adults was normally given or retracted based on how the adults themselves acted and interacted with these young people. To the degree that most volunteers were at sites to do volunteer work, and were amicable enough, this appeared legitimate and even sometimes commendable for all but a very small number of youth offenders.   25

This generally extended to site supervisors as well, who were usually either volunteers or employees of the community organization. Several of the supervisors at observed sites were younger college interns or graduate students, and their appearance and demeanor was largely reflective of this. The two site supervisors at the 4H garden dressed to work (i.e. dressed to get dirty), and   30
while they were authoritative about what needed to be done in the garden, they were hardly authoritarian in their interactions with volunteers or youth, or in their assignment or tasks and job duties.

To be clear, not all RCS sites were as ideal as the 4H garden, or this particular woman's experience at a local church. But none of the observed RCS sites   35
were "work crews" in any sense of the term either. A few sites were more traditional, for example the washing of county vehicles, where community volunteers generally did not participate in such work. However, no youth were required to wash vehicles unless they had been "no-shows" at other sites, or had been asked to leave other RCS sites—something not witnessed by the   40
researcher but did happen on an infrequent basis. Nor were all youth offenders were as amenable to the work itself as some of those mentioned above. But neither were there any major problems at observed sites in terms of refusal to do work, fighting, excessive arguing, or otherwise. Over the course of the research, significant time was spent by the researcher at the juvenile   45

court—usually at least three days a week and sometimes more. When serious incidents arose at RCS sites they were immediately discussed among probation staff and usually relayed to the research by the RCS coordinator. Research notes indicate less than a dozen such incidents (i.e. youth being asked to leave, being visibly intoxicated, or having serious or physical conflicts with others) over the course of this research.

Discussion of Findings

Beyond Work as Corrections

The changes made by the CCJC in its use of community service discussed above can be conceptualized along three lines. These include: (1) a shift towards settings less wedded to strategies of correctionalism and the use of labor as a type of disciplining and/or rehabilitative tactic; (2) a shift towards the use of "real work" in lieu of busywork or work created simply for offenders; and (3) a shift towards such work as the primary locus of interactions between youth and community members.

RCS as it has been used at the CCJC represents a movement away from the "disciplining tactics" common within the use of community service as an intermediate sanction within youth justice. Such tactics frequently organize physical activity and symbolic indicators of delinquency around rituals of compliance and degradation (Braithwaite & Mugford, 1994; Garfinkel, 1956). The use of orange vests or other props that clearly label the individual as an offender; the physical separation of offenders from the public; the attention to bodily movement (i.e. constant surveillance of work and other activities by a staff member whose sole job is to manage such behaviors); and the redundancy of activity (i.e. the repetition of menial tasks) are all commonly employed tactics (Bazemore & Maloney, 1994; Harland, 1980; Krajick, 1982; Vass, 1986). The goals of such tactics are well-established; they are intended to humiliate, to mark the offender, and to ostensibly deter through degradation (Bazemore & Karp, 2004; Garfinkel, 1956; Harland, 1980; Kahan, 1998; Krajick, 1982; Pamment & Ellis, 2010; Vass, 1986).

The use of RCS in Clark County was also, however, a turn away from the rehabilitative logic common within community service, at least in terms of the idea that such work should impart job training or otherwise marketable skills. In cutting the number of required hours to a maximum of 24 under RCS, it was virtually ensured that few serious marketable skills would be imparted in such a short amount of time. In the more general use of the term "rehabilitation," however, this does not exclude the possibility that such work may have contributed to what Maloney (2007, p. 217) has identified as "competency development," or the "basic habits of reporting to work on time, cooperation with co-workers, following instructions, accepting constructive criticism and finishing tasks that can be carried over into life in the community." Nor does it

exclude the possibility that exposure to what Uggen (1999) has called "mean-ingful work," which he argues decreases the likelihood of reoffending, also occurred within RCS settings where the work was purposeful and shared by youth and adults.   5

Moreover, the change in the settings of service sites from work crews to community projects and organizations meant that those present in the capac-ity of community volunteers were less vested in the tactics of identifying and managing "youth offenders." In both doing away with the work crew format, and by turning over the responsibility of work to organizations whose primary   10 function was not the business of corrections itself, interactions between youth and community members were centered less on the question of how to "deal" with youth offenders as any distinct category of people.

This represents half of the concept of "real work"—community volunteers did not supervise youth, nor was their interaction with them predicated on   15 youth as "offenders." The other half of the concept of "real work" involved (as discussed above) the use of work settings that were real places where com-munity members did "real" work. Taken together, these represent an approach to the use of community service that has at its primary goal the facilitation of interactions between youth and community members *within* settings that deli-   20 mit in significant ways the use of service work *as* corrective work.

Best Practice in Restorative Community Service

In several ways, the court's use of RCS echoes much of the best-practice liter-ature on the use of community service in restorative justice, for those that support its use within this approach. Key aspects of best-practice within the   25 use of RCS include proportionality of the service to the offense; relevance of service work to the offense and/or harms caused; the quality and purpose of service work, including work that meets local and immediate community needs; the use of service as a part of a larger set of restorative programs and practices that ideally include the use of victim—offender mediation, restitu-   30 tion, victim services, etc.; and service that is "victim" driven to the greatest extent possible (Bazemore & Karp, 2004; Bazemore & Maloney, 1994; Maloney, 2007; Thomas & Hunninen, 2008; Walgrave, 1999; Walgrave & Geudens, 1996).

Arguably, the use of RCS in Clark County meets these criteria. Given Wash-ington State's use of determinate sentencing, where less serious youth offend-   35 ers are adjudicated or diverted to community supervision, the CCJC's decision to lower the amount of service hours to a maximum of 24 suggests "propor-tionality" to the level of seriousness of offense (Walgrave & Geudens, 1996). In terms of "relevance," the CCJC utilized both VOMs and (beginning in 2004) victim-driven input through its VIP program. In VOMs, victims were able to   40 request that offenders complete service at a specific type of location, often a type of setting related to the offense. In one case for example, a homeowner whose house had been vandalized requested that the youth complete their

service at a retirement home or similar location for the reason that his elderly
mother was the occupant of the home at the time and had been shaken by the
vandalism. The benefit of integrating VOMs with RCS in such cases was that the
VOM agreement could be forwarded to the RCS coordinator, who in turn could
locate and set up an RCS site at such a location.

When victims did not make specific requests, community service was linked
to existing *local* organizations in ways that fit with Bazemore and Maloney's
(1994, p. 29) argument that youth should "be placed in positive, productive
roles in the community which allow them to experience, practice, and demon-
strate ability to do something well that others value." The concept of "real
work" fits this criterion insofar as it both required volunteers to work alongside
youth, and did so in settings grounded *in* the community, and not merely work
for the community. This relates to the quality of work, but in terms of pur-
pose, community organizations were also asked to demonstrate and identify
how such work provided significant value for the community. Finally, the
court's use of RCS existed within a larger restorative framework that included
the use of VOMs, victim services (including VIP, which was eventually expanded
in order to contact and provide services to all identified victims of youth crime
in Clark County), CAB, and other restorative programs (discussed above).

Theoretical Implications for Community Service

This model of community service has broader theoretical implications beyond
questions of restorative justice, particularly in terms of the social interactive
aspects of such service work as it has been structured under RCS at the court.
The degree to which youth apparently accepted the legitimacy and purpose of
their service work—in terms of the relatively few conflicts at service sites, high
rates of completion, and interaction with community volunteers—suggests that
social situations may play a large role in the success or failure of community
service. Goffman (1964, pp. 134–135) argued that social situations constitute
a "reality *sui generis*," a reality unto itself insofar as "an individual will find
himself accessible to the naked senses of all others who are 'present,' and
similarly find them accessible to him." Within such environments, Goffman
(1963, p. 11) noted, "The rule of behavior that seems to be common to all sit-
uations and exclusive to them is the rule obliging participants to 'fit in'."

The concept of "fitting in" applies here especially in the transformation of
community service settings from that of work crews to that of working *along-
side* adult community members. Becker (1964, p. 41) used the term "situa-
tional adjustment" to describe the means by which "individuals take on the
characteristics required by the situations they participate in." Matza's (1964)
work also documented the means by which youth offenders often quite readily
conform to legitimate beliefs and behaviors. Rather, what is notable here is
the question of *why* youth so apparently adjusted to and successfully partici-
pated in RCS in a way that they did not under the use of work crews.

One answer may be found in Sykes and Matza's (1957) concept of neutral-
ization techniques, where one of the primary means by which delinquents are
able to "neutralize" the guilt or shame of their actions is through the
technique of "accusing the accuser." As Garfinkel (1956) argued, rituals of
degradation that separate denounced persons from places of "legitimate   5
order"—and we may think here of the degrading aspects of work crew
labor—do so in order to achieve a sense of shameful separation on the part of
the offender. "The denounced person ... must be placed 'outside'," argued
Garfinkel (1956, p. 423), "he must be made strange'." Here, the technique of
"accusing the accuser" can be linked to the ritual process of degrading people   10
through physical and symbolic separation from others. Indeed, as Matza
(1964, p. 102) argued, "The subculture of delinquency is, among other things,
a memory file that collects injustices," particularly, as Braithwaite (1989, p.
24) has argued "when the youth is 'pushed around' in a way that he perceives
as unjust or oppressive."   15

Perceptions of injustice, or lack thereof, may go some way towards explain-
ing the difference between work crews and RCS, but arguably as important is
the degree to which RCS settings mitigate what Becker called the "collective
character" of situational adjustment. "One major consequence of the collec-
tive character of situational adjustment ... is that the group being socialized is   20
able to deviate much more from the standards set by those doing the socializing
than would be possible for an individual" (Becker 1964, p. 48). Becker gives the
examples of medical schools and industrial workers, where each group may be
socialized into resisting expected standards through group loyalties that pres-
sure individuals to respectively withhold or restrict their productivity so that   25
the entire group is not held to the highest standard of a few individuals.

In this sense, Becker (1964, p. 46) argues, "Situational adjustment is very
frequently not an individual process at all, but a collective one." Even where
there is the lack of a cohort or group, for example when an individual enters
prison, he is confronted with the larger group who is already there, and has in   30
place expected norms and "stand ready to tell him how it is and what he
should do" (Becker 1964, p. 47). Yet the reality of RCS was that most of the
social settings were largely "mixed" crowds of youth, community volunteers,
site supervisors, and (in some cases) mentors. There was neither a dynamic of
"collective character" as may occur in work crews, nor was there much degra-   35
dation insofar as volunteers, and indeed all who were present were expected
to perform the same basic work.

Braithwaite (2002) has addressed the degree to which restorative interven-
tions such as VOM or family group conferencing may effectively mitigate
neutralization techniques. "At a victim—offender mediation or conference   40
when the victim is present, it is hard to sustain *denial of victim* or *denial of
injury*. ... Condemnation of the condemners is also more difficult to sustain
when one's condemners engage in a respectful dialog about why the criminal
behavior of concern to them is harmful" (Braithwaite 2002, p. 85). In terms of
community service, however, Bohm (2001) provides an important addition to   45

how programs such as those used by the CCJC may create social situations where youth are less likely to view such work as an injustice, or to collectively deviate from the goals of such work. "A policy implication of neutralization theory would be to delegitimate neutralizations, that is, make them unaccept-
5   able. One way that might be accomplished is by reducing or eliminating social injustices and double standards" (Bohm 2001, p. 52).

While it is difficult to think that RCS—or indeed any community service pro-gram—can eliminate larger social injustices, it is more plausible that the CCJC's reduction of service hours, its commitment to service as "real work,"
10   and its requirement that volunteers do the same work as youth goes some way towards meeting the goals put forth by Bohm. Literature on service learning for youth echoes the importance of feelings of engagement and purpose as being more important predictors of future success rather than time spent on service work or whether or not such work is completed (McGuire & Gamble,
15   2006; Pugh, 1999; Yates & Youniss, 1996). As Bazemore (2006, p. 35) has noted, "the development of personal identity as a law-abiding citizen is shaped in a similar way to identities as those of lawbreakers—in social interactions with others (Erikson, 1964; Lofland, 1969)."[12] The use of RCS at the CCJC sug-gests that the use of "real work" within settings that delimit the denigration
20   of youth in lieu of purposeful work conducted alongside community volunteers represents a notable example of the influence such interactions.

Acknowledgments

References

Bazemore, G. (1998). Restorative justice and earned redemption: Communities, victims, and offender reintegration. *American Behavioral Scientist, 41*(6), 768-813.
Bazemore, G. (2006). *Measuring what really matters in juvenile justice.* Washington,
30   DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
Bazemore, G., & Karp, D. R. (2004). A civic justice corps: Community service as a means of reintegration. *Justice Policy Journal, 1,* 1-37.
Bazemore, G., & Maloney, D. (1994). Rehabilitating community-service: Toward restor-ative service sanctions in a balanced justice system. *Federal Probation, 58*(1), 24-35.
35   Bazemore, G., & Umbreit, M. (1995). *Balanced and restorative justice for juveniles: A national strategy for juvenile justice in the 21st Century.* Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

12. Maruna's (2001, p. 163) research on ex-convicts who have "made good" supports Bazemore's argument, particularly where ex-offenders are afforded opportunities to participate in meaningful processes of earned redemption that may serve to "take away a crucial neutralization (condemna-tion of the condemners) and ... pull ex-offenders more deeply into mainstream society."

Becker, H. S. (1964). Personal change in adult Life. *Sociometry, 27*(1), 40-53.

Bohm, R. (2001). *A primer on crime and delinquency theory* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame, and reintegration.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Braithwaite, J. (2002). *Restorative justice & responsive regulation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Braithwaite, J., & Mugford, S. (1994). Conditions of successful reintegration ceremonies: Dealing with juvenile-offenders. *British Journal of Criminology, 34*(2), 139-171.

Butts, J., & Snyder, H. (1992). *Restitution and juvenile recidivism.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Caputo, G. A. (1999). Why not community service? *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 10*(4), 503-519.

Caputo, G. A. (2004). *Intermediate sanctions in corrections.* Denton, TX: University of North Texas Press.

Cooper, G., & West, A. S. (1981). *An evaluation of the community service restitution program: A cluster analysis.* Denver, CO: University of Denver, Denver Research Institute.

Crawford, A. (2002). The state, community, and restorative justice: Heresy, nostalgia, and butterfly collecting. In L. Walgrave (Ed.), *Restorative justice and the law* (pp. 101-129). Cullompton: Willian.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed method approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Davis, G. (1992). *Making amends: Mediation and reparation in criminal justice.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Doob, A. N., & McFarland, D. P. (1984). *The community service order for youthful offenders: Perceptions and effects.* Toronto, ON: Centre for Criminology, University of Toronto.

Eglash, A. (1977). Beyond restitution: Creative restitution. In J. Hudson & B. Galaway (Eds.), *Restitution and criminal justice* (pp. 91-101). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Erikson, K. (1964). Notes on the sociology of deviance. In H. S. Becker (Ed.), *The other side* (pp. 9-22). New York, NY: Free Press.

Garfinkel, H. (1956). Conditions of successful degradation ceremonies. *American Journal of Sociology, 61*(5), 420-424.

Gavrielides, T. (2007). *Restorative justice theory and practice: Addressing the discrepancy.* Helsinki: European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control.

Gerard, G. (1996). *Face to face with urban crime: Community-based restorative justice in Minneapolis.* Minneapolis, MN: Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, University of Minnesota.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Behavior in public places; notes on the social organization of gatherings.* New York, NY: Free Press of Glencoe.

Goffman, E. (1964). The neglected situation. *American Anthropologist, 66*(6), 133-136.

Governor's Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee. (2005). *Washington State juvenile justice report 2005.* Olympia, WA: Governor's Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee.

Harding, J. (1980). *Community service orders: Implications of the British experience for the American justice system.* Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Harding, J. (1987). *Probation and the community: A practice and policy reader.* New York, NY: Tavistock.

Harland, A. T. (1980). Court-ordered community-service in criminal-law: The continuing tyranny of benevolence. *Buffalo Law Review, 29*(3), 425-486.

5

10

15

20

25

30

35

40

45

50

55

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 Ham.

Hudson, J., Galaway, B., & Novack, S. (1980). *National assessment of adult restitution programs: Final report*. Duluth, MN: School of Social Development, University of Minnesota.

Jengeleski, J. L., & Richwine, D. J. (1987). *Community service centers in Pennsylvania*. Shippensburg, PA: Shippensburg University.

Johnstone, G., & Van Ness, D. W. (2007). The meaning of restorative justice. In G. Johnstone & D. W. Van Ness (Eds.), *Handbook of restorative justice* (pp. 5-23). Portland, OR: Willan.

Kahan, D. M. (1998). Punishment incommensurability. *Buffalo Criminal Law Review, 1*(2), 691-708.

Karp, D. R. (2001). Harm and repair: Observing restorative justice in Vermont. *Justice Quarterly, 18*(4), 727-757.

Karp, D. R. (2002). The offender/community encounter: Stakeholder involvement in the Vermont reparative boards. In D. R. Karp & T. Clear (Eds.), *What is community justice* (pp. 61-86). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Killias, M., Aebi, M., & Ribeaud, D. (2000). Does community service rehabilitate better than short-term imprisonment? Results of a controlled experiment *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice, 39*(1), 40-57.

Krajick, K. (1982). Community service: The work ethic approach to punishment. *Corrections Magazine, 8*(5), 70-82.

Kurki, L. (2000). Restorative and community justice in the United States. *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research, 27*, 235-303.

Leibrich, J., Galaway, B., & Underhill, Y. (1986). Community-service sentencing in New-Zealand: A survey of users. *Federal Probation, 50*(1), 55-64.

Lieb, R., & Brown, M. (1999). Washington State's solo path: Juvenile sentencing guidelines. *Federal Sentencing Reporter, 11*(5), 273-277.

Lofland, J. (1969). *Deviance and identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

London, R. D. (2006). Paradigms lost: Repairing the harm of paradigm discourse in restorative justice. *Criminal Justice Studies: A Critical Journal of Crime, Law and Society, 19*(4), 397-422.

Maloney, D. (2007). Restorative community service: Earning redemption, gaining skills, and proving worth. *Reclaiming Children and Youth, 15*(4), 214-219.

Maloney, D., & Holcomb, D. (2001). In pursuit of community justice: Deschutes County, Oregon. *Youth & Society, 33*(2), 296-313.

Matza, D. (1964). *Delinquency and drift*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Maruna, S. (2001). *Making good: How ex-convicts reform and rebuild their lives*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

McCold, P. (2004). Paradigm muddle: The threat to restorative justice posed by its merger with community justice. *Contemporary Justice Review: Issues in Criminal, Social and Restorative Justice, 7*(1), 13-35.

McDonald, D. (1986). *Punishment without walls: Community service sentences in New York City*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

McDonald, D., & National Institute of Justice (U.S.) (1988). *Restitution and community service*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Justice.

McGuire, J. K., & Gamble, W. C. (2006). Community service for youth: The value of psychological engagement over number of hours spent. *Journal of Adolescence, 29*(2), 289-298.

McIvor, G. (1992). *Sentenced to serve: The operation and impact of community service by offenders*. Brookfield, VT: Avebury.

Moon, M. M., Sundt, J. L., Cullen, F. T., & Wright, J. P. (2000). Is child saving dead? Public support for juvenile rehabilitation. *Crime & Delinquency, 46*(1), 38-60.

Morris, N., & Tonry, M. (1991). *Between prison and probation intermediate punishments in a rational sentencing system.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Neuman, W. L. (2000). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Newton, A. (1979). Sentencing to community service and restitution. *Criminal Justice Abstracts, 11,* 435-468.

Nirel, R., Landau, S. F., Sebba, L., & Sagiv, B. (1997). The effectiveness of service work: An analysis of recidivism. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 13*(1), 73-92.

Pamment, N., & Ellis, T. (2010). A retrograde step: The potential impact of high visibility uniforms within youth justice reparation. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice, 49*(1), 18-30.

Pease, K. (1982). Community service. *Justice of the Peace, 27,* 740.

Pease, K. (1985). Community service orders. *Crime and Justice, 6,* 51-94.

Perrier, D. C., & Pink, F. S. (1985). Community service: All things to all people. *Federal Probation, 32,* 32-38.

Pranis, K., & Umbreit, M. (1992). *Public opinion research challenges perception of wide spread public demand for harsher punishment.* Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota Citizens Council on Crime and Justice.

Pugh, M. J. (1999). Adolescent community service participation: The nexus of developmental opportunities, interpersonal relationships, and identity (Doctoral dissertation, Catholic University of America, Washington DC, 1999).

Rowe, W. (2002). *A meta-analysis of six Washington State restorative justice projects: Accomplishments and outcomes [including recidivism follow up study].* Olympia, WA: Governor's Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee.

Rubin, H. T. (1986). Community service restitution by juveniles: Also in need of guidance. *Juvenile & Family Court Journal, 37*(1), 1-8.

Schneider, A. L. (1985). *Guide to juvenile restitution.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Restitution Education Specialized Training and Technical Assistance Program.

Schwartz, I. M. (1992). Public attitudes toward juvenile crime and juvenile justice: Implications for public policy. In I. M. Schwartz (Ed.), *Juvenile justice policy* (pp. 225–250). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Shapland, J. (2003). Restorative justice and criminal justice: Just responses to crime. In A. von Hirsch, J. Roberts, A. E. Bottoms, K. Roach & M. Schiff (Eds.), *Restorative justice & criminal justice: Competing or reconcilable paradigms* (pp. 193-217). Oxford: Hart.

Sykes, G. M., & Matza, D. (1957). Techniques of neutralization: A theory of delinquency. *American Sociological Review, 22*(6), 664-670.

Thomas, D., & Hunninen, M. (2008). Making things right: Meaningful community service for juvenile offenders. *Technical Assistance to the Juvenile Court Bulletin* (pp. 1-20). Reno, NV: National Center for Juvenile Justice.

Tonry, M. H. (1997). *Intermediate sanctions in sentencing guidelines.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs National Institute of Justice.

Tonry, M., & Lynch, M. (1996). Intermediate sanctions. *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research, 20,* 99-144.

Uggen, C. (1999). Ex-offenders and the conformist alternative: A job quality model of work and crime. *Social Problems, 46*(1), 127-151.

Vass, A. (1986). Community service: Areas of concern and suggestions for change. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice, 25*(2), 100-111.

Walgrave, L. (1999). Community service as a cornerstone of a systematic response to (juvenile) crime. In G. Bazemore & L. Walgrave (Eds.), *Restorative juvenile justice: Repairing the harm of youth crime* (pp. 129-154). Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Walgrave, L., & Geudens, H. (1996). The restorative proportionality of community service for juveniles. *European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice, 4*, 361-380.

Weber, M. (1975). *Roscher and Knies: The logic problems of historical economics.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Wright, M. (1989). Introduction. In B. Galaway & M. Wright (Eds.), *Mediation and criminal justice: Victims, offenders and community* (pp. 1-3). London: Sage.

Yates, M., & Youniss, J. (1996). Community service and political-moral identity in adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 6*(3), 271-284.

Zehr, H. (1990). *Changing lenses: A new focus for crime and justice.* Scottdale, PA: Herald.

Zehr, H. (2007). Justice paradigm shift? Values and visions in the reform process *Conflict Resolution Quarterly, 12*(3), 207-216.