The Next Step

Indigenous Development of Neighborhood-Restorative Community Justice

Michael J. Gilbert
Tanya L. Settles
University of Texas at San Antonio

The challenge for modern crime-control policies is that they must work simultaneously across multiple environments within communities that are characterized by overlapping needs, issues, and service providers. Policy responses to crime must do more than capture and punish criminals, because crime is a deeply embedded social problem, and effective crime control requires more than a traditional justice system can offer. This article explores the effect of blending the theoretical underpinnings of restorative and community justice as an indigenous product of neighborhoods. Indigenous neighborhood processes may be able to address institutional and social structure problems to improve the quality of life for area residents and restorative outcomes for victims, the community, and the offender.

Keywords: justice; restorative justice; community justice; peacemaking; crime control; victims; offenders

The policy challenge for crime control in modern societies is that, to be effective, policies must work simultaneously in a multidimensional environment characterized by overlapping needs, issues, and service providers within individual communities. Acknowledgement of a multidimensional environment also recognizes that crime problems do not occur in a social vacuum. Crime is a deeply embedded social problem, and policy responses to crime must do more than capture and punish criminals. Street crime, for example, is highly concentrated in neighborhoods that suffer multiple deprivations. These types of neighborhoods have layer upon layer of adverse social conditions—high birth rates among school-age children, youngest parents, largest families, most single-parent families, fewest families with health insurance, lowest family income, highest unemployment, lowest property values, poorest schools, fewest jobs, fewest grocery stores, active street gangs, open air drug markets, street prostitution, progressive loss of middle-class residents, and a rising sense of helplessness, hopelessness, and fatalism among residents who remain (Anderson, 1990; Wilson, 1987). Punishment-oriented policies do little to help residents repair these conditions or stabilize their neighborhoods. Despite this, the traditional justice system is unlikely to be replaced by alternative approaches to justice in the foreseeable future. That said, increased application of restorative and community justice principles and practices could offer new strategies that work synergistically and more effectively within the multidimensional environment of modern society.

The literature on community and restorative justice has increased dramatically during the past decade. In part, this growth is a response to mounting evidence that traditional approaches to justice do not work as effectively as hoped because they focus on punishment of the guilty (Austin & Irwin, 2001; Beckett & Sasson, 2004; Reiman, 1998). The traditional justice system is unable to provide meaningful restoration to victims, exonerate victims from responsibility for their victimization, or repair the harm caused to communities. Nor does it offer opportunities for the offender to be personally accountable to those harmed and reintegrate victims and offenders back into the repaired fabric of the community. Traditional justice does little to improve the quality of life in high-crime areas or ameliorate underlying social and economic problems that may be criminogenic. Victims often feel cheated by a system that does not acknowledge their loss, and communities continue to experience fear of crime and—worse—fear of their neighbors as potential enemies (Clear & Cadora, 2003; Coates & Umbreit, 1999; Umbreit, 1994, 1996, 1997; Umbreit, Coates, & Vos, 2001, 2002a, 2002b; Van Ness & Strong, 2002).

Some of this literature has focused on whether community justice and restorative justice can be merged without compromising their theoretical and pragmatic integrity. The debate concerns whether the process orientation of restorative justice and the outcomes orientation of community justice are mutually compatible (Bazemore & Schiff, 2004; McCold, 2004). We fear that a debate over theoretical purity no longer sees "the forest for the trees" and loses sight of the fact that crime is a social problem that is directly or indirectly harmful to victims, communities, and the offenders themselves. It is also harmful to the government by eroding its capacity to promote public safety and operate in a manner consistent with the principles of a participatory and discursive democracy (Dzur & Olson, 2004). In our view, effective policy responses must address the harms caused by crime and the underlying social inequalities that predispose certain areas to high rates of street crime.

Rather than choosing sides—restorative or community justice—we offer an alternative discussion that is based on the theoretical underpinnings of each. One of the key issues we explore is whether governmental agencies provide satisfactory conditions for theoretically consistent implementation and management of either restorative or community justice programs. The bureaucratic aspects of modern justice organizations may undercut the values and goals of these kinds of programs. When community-based justice processes are implemented, the role of government may need to be redefined from ownership, direction, and control of justice processes to collaboration, partnership, support, and facilitation of neighborhood-oriented processes.

We close the article with a discussion of an intermediate, synergistic application of restorative and community justice principles in ways that incorporate the theoretical and practical strengths of both—especially in high-crime neighborhoods. We suggest that restorative community justice may be more effective than either restorative justice or community justice alone. In our view, the key element is that the processes are indigenous to the neighborhood they serve and are developed, implemented, directed, and controlled by area residents with the assistance and support of government as opposed to the direction and control of government.

Some argue that restorative justice and community justice are incompatible constructs. From their view, a blended model of restorative community justice is not restorative because it views the community as the victim rather than the actual people harmed

(McCold, 2004; Strang, 2004). We reject the "purist" view and argue that community justice and restorative justice can be integrated in ways that preserve the position of individual victims while increasing community involvement.

Restorative Justice and Community Justice: Patterns, Problems, and Issues

Restorative justice and community justice are different concepts that have a number of common elements. Both attempt to find justice and prevent crime through involvement of the relevant stakeholders—victims, offenders, community, and government—but different approaches are used (Kurki, 2000).

Restorative Justice

Restorative justice views crime as a harm to individuals, their neighborhoods, the surrounding community, and even the offender. Crimes produce injuries that must be repaired by those who caused the injury. In this sense, crimes are more than a violation of law, and justice is more than punishment of the guilty. Restorative justice strives to promote healing through structured communication processes among victims, offenders, community representatives, and government officials. It also strives to accomplish these goals in a manner that promotes peace and order for the community, vindication for the victim, and recompense for the offender. Under this restorative perspective, justice is not based on punishment inflicted but the extent to which harms have been repaired and future harms prevented (Van Ness & Strong, 2002, pp. 37-51). The goal of traditional justice is punishment of those who violate the law, and the legal status of victims and witnesses is reduced to serving as material witnesses. The conflict is not between the offender and victim but between the offender's lawyer and the prosecutor, with the judge as referee. In this context, the government owns the conflict. Under a restorative justice perspective, the conflict was created by harms imposed on the victim by the offender who incurred an obligation to repair the harm. Consequently, the conflict is not owned by the government but is owned by the victim and the offender. Restorative justice also recognizes that the crime harmed the community and created a threat to public safety for the government. Collaborative strategies empower participants by providing a level playing field for all stakeholders. The stakeholders work in good faith toward the goals of repairing harms and finding justice, which produces vindication and restoration for the victim, peace for the community, public order and safety for the government, and accountability and recompense for the offender (McCold, 2004; Umbreit, Coates, & Vos, 2004; Van Ness & Strong, 2002; Zehr, 2002). Collaborative problem solving through shared, nonadversarial dialogue accomplishes many things. It humanizes both victim and offender by allowing them to express their feelings to one another, recognizes the harms experienced, allows the offender to explain his or her actions, clarifies and reinforces community values, strengthens informal social controls, and empowers residents to work together to improve their community (Dzur & Olson, 2004, pp. 93-98).

A great amount of literature has compared various types of restorative processes, including family group conferencing (FGC), victim–offender reconciliation programs (VORP), or victim–offender mediation/dialogue (VOM/D), reintegrative shaming, and other processes that

can best be described as hybrids that integrate these key components in different ways (for reviews of much of this literature, see Braithwaite, 1999; Coates & Umbreit, 1999; Kurki, 2000; Umbreit, 1994, 1996, 1997; Umbreit et al., 2002a, 2002b, 2004). Victims, offenders, and their respective support groups often perceive restorative justice programs as successful and are generally satisfied with the outcomes (Coates & Umbreit, 1999; Umbreit, 1994, 1996, 1997; Umbreit et al., 2001, 2002a, 2002b; Van Ness & Schiff, 2001; Van Ness & Strong, 2002).

After an extensive literature review, Kurki (2000) pointed out that at that time there was little published research documenting the efficacy of either restorative justice or community justice programs in reducing recidivism. However, she noted that there is "no evidence that the traditional criminal justice system does a better job and many are convinced that it does a worse one" (p. 287). During the past several years, research evidence of the impact of restorative justice programs on recidivism has begun to emerge. Bonta, Wallace-Capretta, and Rooney (1998) found that probationers who participated in the Restorative Resolutions Project were significantly more successful in satisfying the conditions of their probation and had lower recidivism rates than other probationers. A few years later, Bonta, Wallace-Capretta, Rooney, and McAnoy (2002) published a second study and reported two key findings. First, they summarized 30 research projects from 1976 and 2001 and noted that these studies had produced fairly consistent evidence of significant reductions in recidivism. Second, they found reduced recidivism remained a significant main effect among adult offenders charged with serious nonviolent crimes when offender risk and possibility of net widening were controlled. Maxwell and Morris (2002) reported similar effects on recidivism in their evaluation of an Australian program.

Umbreit et al. (2002b) reviewed 63 empirical studies of programs in five countries between 1985 and 2001. Of these studies, 24 included assessments of recidivism (21 program evaluations and 3 meta-analyses). Among the 8 inferential studies reviewed, statistically significant reductions in recidivism were found in 6 studies (2 were meta-analyses and 1 program evaluation produced mixed results). One of the inferential studies found no significant differences. Among the 16 qualitative studies reviewed, reductions in the recidivism rates were noted in 14 studies, and 1 of these was a meta-analysis. The 2 remaining descriptive studies produced mixed results.

More recently, Welsh and Farrington (2005, pp. 346-347) used a rigorous selection process to identify the best meta-analyses for a systematic literature review of "evidence-based crime prevention." They report that the research evidence is now sufficient to conclude that restorative justice practices, especially face-to-face conferences between victims and offenders, often have significant impacts associated with reduced offender recidivism, victim satisfaction, and alleviation of the victim's fear of revictimization. Although research results are mixed, it appears that the efficacy of restorative justice practices in reducing recidivism and producing preferable outcomes for all stakeholders is gradually being established.

Community Justice

Community justice tends to be highly structured and controlled by criminal justice agencies and may result in punitive sanctions against offenders. However, the primary goals are to strengthen neighborhoods, promote social justice, and improve the quality of life for

residents in neighborhoods. Mostly, these goals are accomplished by marshalling citizen participation in reducing crime through practices that employ traditional strategies— increased surveillance, detection, and government-sanctioned punishment for the guilty— and strengthen informal social controls among residents (Clear & Cadora, 2003; Karp & Clear, 2002b; McCold, 2004). Community justice programs are often geographically oriented and include strategies such as community policing, citizen patrols, neighborhood watch, community or neighborhood courts, teen courts, drug courts, parole and probation supervision, halfway houses, group homes, and other programs within a specific area. In theory, these efforts build relationships within the community and between the community and the justice system. It is thought that the involvement of residents in proactive crime-control programs and projects will simultaneously improve neighborhood social capital needed to pursue collective goals (Clear & Cadora, 2003, pp. 4-5) and improve prosocial informal social controls that have eroded over time (Clear & Cadora, 2003, pp. 12-14).

Although the research literature on community justice programs has produced mixed results, the case studies presented by Karp and Clear (2002a, 2002b) and Clear and Cadora (2003) point to the potential of community justice programs to help stabilize neighborhoods. Forgays and DeMilio (2005) compared outcomes for teenage repeat offenders processed by a teen court program against the outcomes of a random selection of repeat offenders who were processed through the standard juvenile adjudication process. They found that youths processed through the teen court program were significantly more likely to complete their sentences successfully and had significantly lower recidivism rates. Finally, Welsh and Farrington (2005, pp. 347-348), in a systematic literature review of meta-analyses to clarify what works, note that multilevel strategies designed to prevent repeat residential burglaries in specific areas had been successful when tailored to local conditions and circumstances. They also find that evidence on focused policing strategies, in hot-spot areas, can be effective at preventing crime in these areas. Both closed-circuit television monitoring and improved street lighting, in selected areas, were reported as having significant effects in reducing crime. Finally, police departments in most major cities have adopted community policing strategies where officers strive to build constructive relationships with the residents and businesses in their assigned patrol area. This is often augmented by geographical analysis of crime patterns and trends to identify specific community areas for targeted interventions. Supportive findings in the preliminary research literature, along with prevalence of community-oriented policing practices, suggest that community justice concepts have salience to both citizens and justice officials.

Why Neighborhood-Based Programs?

The perceived quality of life within any community is directly affected by street crimes; often, property crimes, vandalism, graffiti, street drug use, and street drug sales have a more pervasive impact on quality of life than occasional incidents of violence. Although street crimes can, and do, occur everywhere within rural villages, suburban towns, or urban cities, they do not equally occur everywhere. Street crimes are much more prevalent in areas with high rates of poverty, multiple social deprivations, and a pervasive sense of hopelessness, helplessness, and fatalism among residents. Areas with these characteristics often have consistently high rates of street crime and are local hot spots. Hot-spot neighborhoods have often

been hot for decades. People come and go, but chronic adverse social conditions set the stage for persistent high rates of crime, and these conditions have remained: concentrated poverty, low education, large families, high unemployment rates, poor schools, densely populated public housing projects, active street gangs, open air drug markets, street drug use, street prostitution, high birth rates to school-age mothers, deteriorated or abandoned housing stock, low housing values, low home ownership rates, ineffective informal social controls, few grocery stores, few medical clinics, high concentrations of bars and taverns, pawn shops, pay-day loan stores, and limited capital investment (Anderson, 1990; Bursik & Grasmick, 1993; Wilson, 1987).

Disadvantaged areas such as these are also attractive to active street criminals who need low-cost housing and end up living next to poor, but law-abiding, families who strive to raise good children. As parolees try to re-enter society, they often experience difficulty obtaining housing and many end up living in these same areas. All too often, they are living in the same neighborhoods where they grew up and first got into trouble. The lack of a viable economic base in these areas usually reflects historical patterns of racism, discrimination, and segregation as well as progressive middle-class and capital flight as neighborhood social conditions declined (Wilson, 1987). Those residents who remain are increasingly stigmatized and demoralized by a pervasive sense of helplessness, hopelessness, and fatalism about their inability to improve the quality of their lives. Chronic exposure to adverse social conditions is associated with high rates of street crime among residents who feel they have few legitimate opportunities to better their lives, which, in turn, reinforces neighborhood decline (Anderson, 1990). Living in this type of environment is thought to deteriorate prosocial institutions and informal social controls that would otherwise help keep neighborhood crime in check (Peterson, Krivo, & Harris, 2000).

Reversing the downward spiral of neighborhood social conditions takes consistent long-term efforts and investment. The scope of the problem is daunting, yet it is clear that efforts and resources must be concentrated on selected areas with serious chronic problems—these areas are almost always hot spots for crime. Consistent, long-term social investments such as recreation centers and similar social institutions aimed at reversing the impact of decades of neglect in hot-spot neighborhoods are needed (Peterson et al., 2000). Endemic feelings of helplessness, hopelessness, and fatalism lead to despair among residents in high-crime areas. The policy challenge is to replace despair with hope, empowerment, common purpose, and action dedicated to improving the quality of life for residents.

The development of programs that are indigenous to neighborhoods they serve and designed to help residents improve the quality of their lives by applying the principles of restorative and community justice is one place to start. Motivated, empowered, and supported residents can do a lot to improve the quality of life in their neighborhoods.[1] Neighborhood-based justice programs are, in our view, a logical and a necessary extension of the community justice and restorative justice movements. Such programs could help residents develop a renewed sense of hope and empowerment when they meet one another as colleagues to work with victims, offenders, and their neighborhood to find justice by holding people accountable for problem behaviors in their neighborhood, reducing the visible signs of crime and fear, improving conditions to encourage capital investment and job creation, and increasing the capacity for self-governance through education and leadership.

Patterns in Existing Programs

It is important to review patterns in restorative and/or community justice programs to gain an understanding of how they have been conducted and the extent to which these programs meet basic theoretical requirements. In this section, we will review 10 programs operated by police, courts, and corrections agencies that are designed to apply restorative justice or community justice principles to crime control. These 10 programs were not randomly selected. In some cases, we had direct knowledge of the programs through either professional associations or previous research. In other cases, the programs were selected because they exhibited a standard of best practice and were considered to be model programs in some respect. We deliberately sought to identify programs that involve all stakeholder groups—victims, offenders, communities, and governments. However, some of these programs are much less inclusive than others, involving some but not all stakeholder groups. Each of the 10 programs selected is managed by a governmental entity—usually police, courts, or corrections.

Police-Administered Programs

Perhaps the most well known of the police-administered restorative programs is the Reintegrative Shaming Experiments (RISE) in Canberra, Australia. This restorative process involved a police officer facilitating a highly emotional meeting among offenders, their supporters, victims, and the victim's supporters after random assignment of cases to either traditional court processing or the diversion conference treatment. The goal of each conference was to conduct a group discussion of the consequences of the offender's actions and develop a restitution plan (Lemley, 2001). Early findings suggested that offenders who participated in the RISE program resulted in somewhat better outcomes than offenders who were processed in a traditional court (Braithwaite, 1999). Subsequently, an evaluation of the RISE program by Sherman, Strang, and Woods (2000) revealed mixed results. Diversionary conferences were associated with a substantial reduction in recidivism among violent youths, a slight increase in recidivism among offenders charged with driving while intoxicated, and no differences in recidivism among property offenders charged with personal property theft or shoplifting.

One legal concern of both academics and researchers about this type of program is whether police could adequately ensure due process protections for offenders (Lemley, 2001; McCold & Wachtel, 1998). Concerns about a police agency's ability to protect due process are legitimate and cannot be ignored. The legal issue is that it presents a separation of powers conflict when an executive agency is responsible for a quasi-judicial process mediating conflicts caused by crime and overseeing sanctioning. Yet these concerns have not been found to be as significant a problem as originally anticipated because police-administered programs typically require a formal, legal, and voluntary admission of guilt before an offender is allowed to participate in the restorative process (McCold & Wachtel, 1998). At one level, this legal admission of guilt clears the administrative path for community and restorative justice. At another level, it is important for offenders to voluntarily accept responsibility for the harms they caused before they meet victims. This prevents revictimization of victims (Van Ness & Strong, 2002; Zehr, 2002), particularly when the

tone of the restorative encounter is based on meaningful dialogue and sensitivity to the needs of the victim.

Two American examples of police-administered programs are the FGC programs operated by the Bethlehem Police Department in Pennsylvania and the Woodbury Police Department in Minnesota. The Bethlehem Police Department program brings together the offender and victim with their families or support groups to participate in a facilitated discussion about the crime and its effects on the victim, the victim's family, the offender, and the offender's family. The primary goal is to determine appropriate ways for the offender to make amends to the victim. However, neither the community at large nor the neighborhoods adjacent to the crime are typically represented in these processes (McCold, 2003).

In 1995, the police department in Woodbury, Minnesota, began a restorative justice program without the active participation of the Washington County Court. They adopted an FGC model and initially used the program coordinator as the facilitator for most of the conferences (Hines & Bazemore, 2003). As time progressed, they recruited and trained a cadre of community volunteers to act as facilitators. This restorative justice program routinely involved at-large community representatives in the conferencing process. Although then Woodbury program dealt mostly with juveniles charged with minor crimes, this has since changed. In 2001, the program was made available to juveniles charged with more serious offenses, including serious felonies such as robbery and assault. The department has also started to experiment with the use of restorative justice to manage selected adult offenders. The key to determining which offenders (juvenile or adult) were offered the restorative justice program was based solely on the discretion of trained police officers during the call for service. The primary caveat was that the victim and offender had to be willing to participate in the process (Hines & Bazemore, 2003; Settles, 2001). The community has always been informally involved in determining how restorative justice practices would be used in Woodbury, but the police department moved to formalize community input through the formation of Community Accountability Boards. These boards work in partnership with the police department to shape the policy governing the use of restorative justice practices (Settles, 2001). In this regard, the South Oxnard Challenge Project in Ventura County, California, is similar in scope to the expanded program in Woodbury. Although it is managed by a correctional agency, it receives financial and administrative support from a variety of governmental entities that collaborate in decision making and conferencing efforts to manage a wide range of youthful offenders (Karp, Lane, & Turner, 2002).

With the exception of the controlled, quasi-experimental research design used to evaluate the RISE project in Australia, the evaluation research findings for police-administered programs tend to be highly limited because of inadequate research design and small sample sizes. Both problems threaten the external validity of the findings. Future research on police-administered programs will need to correct for these inadequacies.

Court-Administered Programs

As with police-administered programs, court-administered programs experience many of the same difficulties with inadequate research design, small sample size, and external validity. However, one area where courts seem to offer an improvement over police-administered processes is that they tend to be more inclusive. Court-based programs tend to solicit greater

participation from both community members and other criminal justice agencies. Interestingly, these types of programs often focus more on a community justice model than a pure restorative justice approach. Perhaps this is because courts are highly sensitive to due process concerns.

In Portland, Oregon, community involvement in government has a long history. One of the most recent occurrences in the evolution of community justice is the Community Court Program. Based on a community prosecution model (Boland, 1998), the program mirrors the traditional court system in that it requires the participation and involvement of the police and neighborhood district attorneys and input from the various communities within the city. Community courts appear in every geographic sector. A Citizen Advisory Board governs each court and is charged with identifying the crime problems that are of greatest concern in that area of the city and finding solutions to these problems. These courts draw on the combined resources and strengths of city and county agencies and on volunteer organizations within their region (Wolf & Worrall, 2004). Court officials, police officers, and crime prevention specialists from the Office of Neighborhood Involvement participate in Citizen Advisory Board meetings. Recently, a new community court was added for the central business district in downtown Portland. The purpose and goal of this court was to be responsive to the specific issues of interest to area business owners (Settles, 2001). As with the traditional courts, Portland's community courts treat victims and offenders as material witnesses. Consequently, victims are not actively involved in the process of finding justice.

The community justice model in Austin, Texas (Travis County), mirrors, in many ways, Portland's Community Court Program. This program is the result of the vision of District Attorney Ronald Earle, who has identified ways to operate a number of programs and approaches that incorporate community courts, particularly for youthful and young adult offenders who frequent nightclubs and restaurants in the downtown area. Perhaps Earle's most important contribution to community prosecution and community justice is reflected in the manner by which burglaries of vehicles in the downtown area of Austin were addressed. The District Attorney's Office and the Community Court Advisory Board held community meetings and conducted a survey to identify the crimes of most concern to businesses and residents in the downtown area. As a result, burglary of vehicles was identified as the primary crime problem in the downtown area. This led to additional analyses to determine how and why vehicles were targeted for burglary. Eventually, private businesses joined in a focused effort to reduce vehicle burglaries. Although the city experienced a 40% drop in vehicle burglaries in the downtown area during the 1st month of the program (Wolf & Worrall, 2004, p. 63), we find no evidence of dialogue between victims and offenders.

More recently, Earle has experimented with reconciliation circles that are consistent with restorative justice principles. These circles strive to include all those who have been affected by a crime—victims, offenders, family and support groups, and community members. Although a judge remains legally responsible for imposing sentences and determining punishment, both are the result of a recommendation made by participants in a reconciliation circle (Community Justice Exchange, 2005). To the extent that the resolution of individual cases is more heavily focused on repairing harms than punishment, this process appears to be more restorative than it might have otherwise been.

The common element in these examples of court-administered restorative justice processes is that they tend to marginalize or exclude direct victims and involve representatives of the community at large rather than of the neighborhood where the crime occurred.

Corrections-Administered Programs

The Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ) has taken significant steps toward incorporating restorative principles into correctional practice. One program includes VOM/D for victims of violent crime. However, because this process occurs after adjudication and sentencing, the offender's participation does not alter his or her sentence. It does, however, offer an opportunity for the offender to make amends for some of the damage caused to the victim (or surrogate victim) of his or her crime. Yet this type of program fails to fully address the needs of the offender for reparation. This is particularly true when utilized for offenders awaiting capital punishment (Roche, 2001, p. 350). For this reason, we argue that this process only offers a modest potential for restoration to victims and offenders alike. The benefit to victims (or surrogates) is that offenders hear the victim's story about the impact of the harms they have experienced. This process does not involve community or neighborhood representatives.

Another TDCJ program is oriented toward the re-entry of violent offenders who have served much of their sentence under administrative segregation. This program focuses on the use of restorative practices and principles to assist these offenders as they strive to re-enter society. The program uses community mentorship and intensive dialogue between a group of carefully selected community members and the formerly incarcerated person (TDCJ, 2002). Yet it is difficult for us to categorize this approach as being truly restorative because, as Roche (2001) points out, dialogue and restoration between the victim and offender are nonexistent.

In Vermont, there is another well-known corrections-administered process in which non-violent offenders sentenced to reparative probation meet with a board of citizens (Dzur & Wertheimer, 2002, pp. 8-11). This process attempts to encompass the core values of restorative justice by providing reparation to victims and communities through a dialogue with the offender, development of individualized community service plans, and collective agreement on the activities that they require an offender to complete. These strategies are aimed at reducing recidivism and increasing the offender's awareness of the harms suffered by the victim and the community (Karp & Drakulich, 2004; Karp, Sprayregen, & Drakulich, 2002; Lemley, 2001). Although reparative probation is supported by Vermont law, some suggest that the goal of direct victim participation is overstated and more rhetoric than reality because most cases do not involve offenses with a direct victim. Consequently, victim participation is low, even among cases where a direct victim exists (Dzur & Wertheimer, 2002, p. 9; Karp, 2001; Karp & Drakulich, 2004; McCold, 2004). Nonetheless, an evaluation of the Vermont Reparative Board process claims that it is successful in meeting program goals of repairing harm and reintegrating offenders because a large pool of community volunteers is involved in making sanctioning decisions (Karp & Drakulich, 2004).[2]

McCold (2004) argues that the Vermont Reparative Board process is not truly restorative because it does not focus on the restoration of the victim. Others argue that this program offers significant improvements, compared to traditional probation, because there is a substantial opportunity for community involvement and some opportunity for victim involvement because traditional probation offers little of either (Karp & Drakulich, 2004). Perhaps the most important lesson to be learned from the Vermont Reparative Board experience is that it provides an opportunity to imagine a postadjudication process where the offender is

Table 1
Stakeholder Participants in Restorative or Community Justice Programs

| Source of Administration | Stakeholder Participation | | | Method |
	Offender	Direct Victim	Community	
Police administered				
Bethlehem, PA	X	X	—	Family group conferencing
Woodbury, MN	X	X	X	Family group conferencing
Canberra, Australia	X	X	—	Reintegrative shaming
Court administered				
Portland, OR	X	—	X	Community prosecution
Austin, Travis County, TX	X	Only in some cases	X	Community prosecution and reconciliation circles
Corrections administered				
Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ)	X	—	X	Victim–offender mediation/dialog
TDCJ—SVORI	X	—	X	Reparative boards/mentoring
Vermont Department of Corrections	X	Only in some cases	X	Reparative boards
Washington State Reformatory	X	—	X	Conferencing
Ventura County, South Oxnard Challenge Project	X	X	X	Reparative boards– conferencing hybrids

Note: SVORI = Serious and Violent Offender Re-entry Initiative.

not the central "customer" and the justice system is reoriented to view communities and victims as stakeholders worthy of the status of "client" (Boyes-Watson, 2004).

The Citizen, Victims and Offenders Restoring Justice (CVORJ) program at the Washington State Reformatory is another attempt to incorporate restorative justice principles in a postadjudication correctional setting. In this program, unrelated sets of victims (or victim surrogates) and offenders are brought together with community members. The goals of the program include restoring victim–offender relationships, educating offenders about the experience of victimization, and offering a process to rebuild and heal torn relationships between the community and the offender (Lovell, Helfgott, & Lawrence, 2003). Other important goals of the program include providing a safe place where prisoners are able to express feelings of remorse and ostensibly help them develop competencies needed to become responsible individuals on release and encouraging communities to develop creative ways to think about crime, its causes, and the attainment of justice (Lovell et al., 2003). These types of programs may be beneficial to offenders and perhaps surrogate victims, but they do not deal with direct victims or afford meaningful community participation. Table 1 above summarizes the differences among the 10 programs we reviewed.

Only in the Woodbury and Ventura County programs are all three nongovernment stakeholders (offender, direct victim, community) typically present. In our view, this may be because government-operated programs tend to focus more on "who owns the crime." This focus makes it difficult to share the experiences of crime to achieve restorative goals—restoring

the victim, allowing the offender to make amends, allowing the offender to learn from the impact of crime on victims and communities, and seeking ways to prevent such offending in the future (Karp, 2002). We find it difficult, if not completely impossible, to attain these goals when the processes fail to involve key nongovernmental stakeholders.

Although this review of programs is not meant to be exhaustive, it does highlight three theoretical inadequacies commonly seen in restorative and community justice programs. First, there is a tendency to become focused on offender accountability and offender reintegration. Second, a government agency serves as the dominant stakeholder that determines the type of process used, authorizes forms of accountability and sanctions, and selects offenders deemed entitled to restoration. Finally, there seems to be a tendency to exclude victims or community representatives from active participation in restorative processes and only rarely are both these stakeholders included.

Synthesis: An Intermediate Position

There is an ongoing and vigorous debate about the wisdom of combining community justice with restorative justice. Restorative justice purists focus strongly on a process-oriented definition of restorative justice with few theoretical inconsistencies. They argue that community justice, because of its association with traditional justice, undermines the fundamental values and processes that make restorative justice practices restorative. Furthermore, they argue that practitioners must accurately understand the work they do and identify points where they may consciously and deliberately assure that restorative processes are employed. From their point of view, combining restorative justice with community justice creates confusion over what is and is not restorative (McCold, 2004; Strang, 2004). Outcomes-oriented researchers and practitioners worry that focusing on purity of process may fail to address the structural demands required by these kinds of programs and undermine the goals of restorative justice—reparation of harms, peacemaking, and social benefit to the stakeholders (Bazemore, 2000b; Clear & Cadora, 2003, pp. 64-65; Schiff & Bazemore, 2001; Umbreit et al., 2004; Weitkamp, 1998).

Although we do not wish to complicate what some see as being a "paradigm muddle" (McCold, 2004; Strang, 2004), we argue that what really matters is that the basic requirements of both restorative justice and community justice are met: restoration of victims and offenders and improved quality of life for residents. If the victim, offender, and community collaborate as equal partners with government to repair harms and reintegrate victims and offenders into the community, it is restorative. If the government retains control over the process, if the government owns the victim–offender–community conflict, and if the goal is punishment of the guilty—neither the process nor the outcome is restorative.

Community justice efforts by government agencies to increase social capital and collective efficacy in high-crime areas can be compatible with restorative justice. The core of restorative justice is reflected by three factors: whether the conflict is owned by the victim, the offender, and the community involved; whether the role of the government is to facilitate and support the process and the outcome; and whether repair of harms is the primary goal. The core of community justice is distinguished from restorative justice by other factors: whether government agencies respect the experience and local knowledge of residents by seeking their advice before initiating new programs or projects; whether programs and projects are tailored

to unique community needs; whether agencies genuinely involve residents in the implementation and evaluation of programs and projects; and whether the primary goal is to improve the quality of life for residents. The fundamental factors underlying community justice and restorative justice share a number of common dimensions and, in our view, can be seen as mutually reinforcing rather than mutually exclusive (Bazemore & Maloney, 1994).

Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ)

The tripartite model for community-oriented responses to crime represented by BARJ (Bazemore & Day, 1996, pp. 7-8) integrates restorative justice and community justice concepts and encompasses much of what we suggest in this article with its emphasis placed on three key areas.[3] The first is encouraging accountability of the offender by his or her acceptance of responsibility for his or her actions, followed by satisfying the obligation to make amends for harms caused. Second, offenders should be encouraged to develop the capacity to make constructive and prosocial contributions to their community. Finally, the BARJ model seeks to enhance public safety and community protection through strategic resource allocation. This perspective is succinctly summarized by Bazemore and Day (1996):

> Justice is best served when victims, offenders and communities receive equitable attention in the justice process. The needs of one client cannot be met unless the needs of other clients are addressed. Crime severs the bonds between victims, offenders, and families. Although offenders must take full responsibility for their acts, the responsibility for restoring mutual respect, understanding, and support among those involved must be shared by the community. (p. 8)

However, our point is that, in practice, the three essential elements are often not fully implemented, and their importance is not adequately expressed in theory. First, the involvement of either direct or surrogate victims rarely occurs in most programs. Second, the community is rarely represented by the participation of neighborhood residents who are indirectly victimized by the crime because of their proximity to it. Where community representatives do participate, they generally represent the community at large. Third, the justice processes used are directed and controlled by a government agency that tends to take ownership over the conflict. In short, the process is centralized when a genuine community-based process should be decentralized. A synergistic model drawing from both community justice and restorative justice, in ways that retain the core elements of each and correct for common deficiencies, may be more effective as a crime-control strategy than either one individually. Such an approach would provide an array of crime prevention and control strategies that address more dimensions of the social problem and might be especially useful when geographically focused to help stabilize and improve hot-spot neighborhoods (Morenoff, Sampson, & Raudenbush, 2001).

Why a Blended Model Is Likely to Be Effective

It is commonly accepted that community justice and restorative justice principles and practices represent a substantive shift away from total reliance on the traditional justice

model. Retributive, punishment-oriented policies are no longer the only crime-control approaches available. New justice policies and practices that restore the emotional and material losses experienced by communities and victims and that repair communities are now conceivable as viable policy options (Bazemore, 2000a; Bazemore & Shiff, 1996; Galaway & Hudson, 1990; Umbreit, 1997; Zehr, 1995).

Effective implementation of restorative and community justice crime-control strategies requires many crucial changes in the conceptualization and mechanics of justice to encompass different approaches and strategies. This means that there must be public policy acceptance and support of alternatives to traditional justice. Restorative community justice programs also require that decision making and authority move away from the government and toward residents of the communities they serve. In addition, community representatives play a more active, influential, and critical role in these types of programs. Offender accountability relies on structured communication and dialogue among the offender, the victim, and the community as a means by which accountability is attained. Strengthening community capacity to prevent and control crime means that criminal justice agencies and community justice programs must be able to make referrals to local restorative justice programs. This will require development of referral criteria and mechanisms to ensure that appropriate cases can be distinguished from inappropriate referral cases. Instead of the dominant controlling role typically played by criminal justice agencies in justice processes, these agencies accept a supportive and facilitative role when restorative community justice principles and practices are involved (Bazemore & Day, 1996; Benzry-Miller & Schacter, 2000; Umbreit, 1997; Van Ness & Strong, 2002).

In this context, a blended model employing restorative justice and community justice principles and practices could be used, along with traditional justice policies and practices, to provide crime-control strategies that operate in tandem as part of a multidimensional response to crime that addresses different needs. Restorative justice views crime as a violation of relationships and people. It strives to repair ruptured relationships between victims and offenders—even when they had no prior association. Whenever possible, the consequences of crime are most appropriately and effectively dealt with at the individual level. Consequently, the primary focus in restorative justice is on restoration and empowerment of direct victims as individuals. That said, restorative principles and practices also aim to repair the harms at the aggregate level of the community and government (McCold, 2004; Pranis, 1997; Van Ness & Strong, 2002; Zehr, 1995). Community justice, by contrast, focuses our attention on the negative impacts of crime on particular areas within the urban landscape, and it sensitizes us to the benefit that may be attained by collective empowerment of residents, stronger informal social controls, reduced fear, and greater awareness of the problems of social structure that concentrate street crime in densely populated, poverty-stricken areas that are characterized by multiple deprivations (Anderson, 1990; Dyck, 2000; Wilson, 1987). In short, healing is most needed in those communities closest to the site where street crimes occur—the neighborhood.

We suggest here that multidimensional crime-control strategies that reduce the emphasis on traditional legal justice and foster the development of options rooted in the principles of community and restorative justice are likely to be most effective when they function within a neighborhood context.

Government-Controlled Community and Restorative Justice

As we have shown earlier, centralized and government-controlled models of community justice and restorative justice are, in many ways, only slightly less offender focused than the traditional justice system. Most of these programs exclude the victim or the community from the process of determining justice. Consequently, they are far less restorative and, in our view, less effective than they might appear. When the community does participate in these programs, it is often through at-large representation instead of representation of the areas closest to the site of the crime. In this sense, institutionally managed programs are less restorative to individuals and more likely to fail in attaining their goals (Peterson et al., 2000). Centralized, government-controlled programs have not adequately addressed some key facts: Both victims and offenders are members of neighborhoods (often the same neighborhood), street crimes typically occur very close to home, and neighborhood stakeholders are typically left out regardless of the processes used.

Neighborhood residents are indirect victims who experience increased fear, uncertainty, anxiety, and reduced quality of life because of crimes in their neighborhood because of their proximity. Consequently, they are important stakeholders in the justice process. Like the direct victim, they are inextricably linked by the actions of the offender. However, both traditional criminal justice systems and centralized community and restorative justice programs fail to involve neighborhood residents who are the community stakeholders most harmed by crimes near their homes. Maximum utility of both community justice and restorative justice occurs when all stakeholders are present and work in a collaborative manner to achieve justice. Viewed in this way, multidimensional justice processes should be proactive and produce restoration for the victim, peace and safety within the community, public order for government, recompense for the offender, and an overall improvement in the quality of life for neighborhood residents (Clear & Cadora, 2003; Van Ness & Strong, 2002, pp. 46-49).

As noted earlier, it is rare that all stakeholders participate in either restorative or community justice programs. Based on the programs reviewed here, this seems especially true when governments become the primary stakeholders and control the processes used. In addition, it is much more difficult to identify and deal with victims and neighborhood community representatives. It is not surprising that both community justice and restorative justice programs may be less effective than they could be. Neither the traditional justice system nor government-controlled efforts to apply community and restorative justice principles have effectively dealt with neighborhoods. Both fail to empower residents to "rebuild the village" or "take back the streets" in a manner that is respectful, credible, effective, and tailored to localized community needs. Traditional justice practices by government agencies simply have not recognized neighborhoods as a key element in crime control.

To some extent, local advocates and practitioners of restorative justice and community justice have defined *community* in limiting ways. Some restorative justice advocates think of community in global terms—the state, the city, or a region of the city. In this sense, they are more interested in the restorative effects on the larger surrounding community than on the neighborhood. In the process, they overlook the role of neighborhood residents as indirect

victims. Community justice advocates tend to define community in geographic terms, closer to the concept of a neighborhood, but they are less interested in restoration of either victims or offenders than in proactive efforts to control crime in these areas. Crime control and prevention from this perspective is represented by the concept of vigilance. In both restorative justice and community justice programs, residents of neighborhoods are rarely involved as a key stakeholder group in the process of finding justice for a particular crime by a specific offender.

McCold (2004) vigorously argues that community and restorative justice programs are mutually exclusive and that community is best understood as the community at large. We disagree. Rather than presenting a "policy muddle," a blended model, employing elements of both is a natural, evolutionary step in refining our understanding of these processes. We see no inherent reason why neighborhood-based programs, employing community and restorative justice practices, could not synergistically work with traditional justice. The modern policy challenge for crime control and prevention is to operate in a multidimensional environment to produce positive public safety outcomes that simultaneously restore victims and offenders, hold offenders accountable, and improve safety and tranquility for residents within the neighborhood.

Indigenous Development of Neighborhood-Restorative Community Justice

Neighborhood-restorative community justice should be indigenous to the neighborhoods served. Such programs are not imposed from the outside; they emerge from discussions about neighborhood problems and how best to respond to these problems by residents of the neighborhood. The government would provide support and facilitation but would not direct, control, or own the conflict or the process. The norms associated with the implementation of restorative justice programs require flexibility and sensitivity to the unique needs of a community. These same norms apply to community justice programs.[4] When new justice concepts are introduced to residents of a neighborhood, it must be done in a manner that is sensitive to the unique dynamics of the neighborhood. It must be handled in a way that is respectful of the local knowledge possessed by residents and their ability to determine what is most likely to be effective and meet local needs. They are, after all, the ones who have the best understanding of their neighborhood and the most at stake in the success or failure of any crime-control effort.

One of the aims of indigenous neighborhood justice strategies is to reconstruct feedback mechanisms, embodied by the informal social controls of the village, in a modern context. In high-crime neighborhoods, feedback on individual behavior provided by family and neighbors has been eroded by many changes in society. Such programs must be indigenous products of residents and provide a means for feedback on individual behavior to offenders. In the process, both restorative and community justice goals are likely to be achieved as the harms caused by crime are repaired and the neighborhood is strengthened and stabilized. The spin-off effects of localized indigenous justice programs are likely to be the formation of social capital and increased social efficacy as a result of greater community activism among residents of disadvantaged neighborhoods, whose needs have been ignored

for many years, combined with a new mechanism of informal social control—community feedback on individual behavior.

In theory, these mutually supporting, synergistic, and reinforcing impacts should produce increased public safety in the area, stronger informal social controls, and healthier neighborhoods. Benzry-Miller and Schacter (2000) note that by the time that the justice system is called on, it is reacting to failed or inadequate policies in other areas such as health care, social welfare, housing, and others. They argue that a more proactive, community-based approach would serve to prevent crimes from occurring. This perspective should alert all proponents of community and/or restorative justice to recognize that the micro aspects of street crime are imbedded in the institutional and structural aspects of our society (Dyck, 2000).

Summary

As envisioned here, indigenous processes of neighborhood-restorative community justice are characterized by reframing the role of government to act as the facilitator and supporter of the restorative justice process. At the same time, the government recognizes its legitimate role as an equal stakeholder along with the victim, offender, and neighborhood. In this sense, government no longer carries the sole responsibility for controlling the justice process. However, the government does have the responsibility of providing resources to support neighborhood-restorative community justice programs with physical space and financial resources needed to train mediators and neighborhood representatives. Another key role for government is to bring stakeholders into the process and coordinate restorative community justice processes. To accomplish this, it may be necessary for government to adopt neighborhood-restorative community justice as an official policy option, which in turn could lead to a steady stream of referrals of offenders to neighborhood-based restorative justice processes. As the role of government changes, so must the role of community members change to include greater civic engagement through service as community representatives in restorative justice and community justice programs and processes. This includes being responsible for bringing concerned parties together to participate in restorative justice processes. By doing this, the neighborhood is recognized as having experienced harm. Finally, reparative agreements and decisions are supported, recorded, and enforced by government representatives. Above all, it is essential that community justice practices are indigenous to the neighborhoods they serve and intended to improve social conditions and promote public safety by empowering residents and reinforcing local restorative processes.

The theory of neighborhood-restorative community justice, as an indigenous product of residents, seeks to articulate a coherent rationale for a more inclusive process that links micro-level gains for individuals from restorative justice processes to meso-level and macro-level improvements that change the quality of life for residents of neighborhoods. We suggest that the debate between process and outcome is an artificial consideration. The important debate should be about the best ways to apply what we know to achieve the maximum social benefit. The goal is to produce public safety gains that not only resolve conflicts and heal harms between victims and offenders but also contribute to the repair of

neighborhoods by making them more livable and ameliorating inequalities created by social structure problems. We think that it is possible and that it is time to test-drive indigenous neighborhood-restorative community justice.

Notes

1. Braithewaite (1989) explains the impact of communitarian approaches more thoroughly than is within the scope of this article. Interested readers should refer to his collective work.

2. The goals of reparative probation are identified as allowing victims to describe the impact of the offender's behavior; enabling the offender to make amends to victims, other affected parties, and the community; demonstrating healthy behaviors by the offender and learning ways to avoid reoffending; and enabling the community to offer reintegration to the offender (Dzur & Wertheimer, 2002, p. 10).

3. The "balanced approach" articulated by Bazemore and Maloney (1994) and Bazemore and Day (1996) is drawn from earlier work by Maloney, Romig, and Armstrong (1988), titled "Juvenile Probation: The Balanced Approach," published in *Juvenile and Family Court Journal.*

4. Zehr (2002, pp. 32-33) articulates the principles and norm underlying restorative justice as
- Respect for all involved—victim, offender, community, and government.
- Focusing on the harms caused by crime, the need of victims for restoration, and a concern for the restoration of the community and offender.
- Addressing the obligations that result from those harms—obligations created by the offender to the victim, community, and government and obligations of the community and larger society to the victims, offender, and neighborhood residents.
- Using inclusive, collaborative group processes characterized by open dialog.
- Involving those with a legitimate stake in the situation—victims, offenders, neighborhood or community residents, and society (i.e., government).
- Seeking to put right the wrongs that have occurred.

References

Anderson, E. (1990). *Streetwise: Race, class, and change in an urban community.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Austin, J., & Irwin, J. (2001). *It's about time: America's imprisonment binge* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Bazemore, G. (2000a). Community justice and a vision of collective efficacy: The case of restorative conferencing. In J. Horney (Ed.), *Criminal justice 2000: Policies, processes, and decisions of the criminal justice system* (Vol. 3, pp. 225-298). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Bazemore, G. (2000b). Rock and roll, restorative justice, and the continuum of the real world: A response to "purism" in operationalizing restorative justice. *Contemporary Justice Review*, *3*(4), 459-477.

Bazemore, G., & Day, S. E. (1996). Restoring the balance. Juvenile and community justice. *Juvenile Justice: A Journal of Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 3*(1), 3-14.

Bazemore, G., & Maloney, D. (1994). Rehabilitating community service: Toward restorative service in a balanced justice system. *Federal Probation, 58*(1), 24-36.

Bazemore, G., & Schiff, M. (1996). Community justice/restorative justice: Prospects for a new social ecology for community corrections. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, *20*, 311-335.

Bazemore, G., & Schiff, M. (2004). Paradigm muddle or paradigm paralysis? The wide and narrow roads to restorative justice reform (or, a little confusion may be a good thing). *Contemporary Justice Review, 7*(1), 37-57.

Beckett, K., & Sasson, T. (2004). *The politics of injustice: Crime and punishment in America* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Benzry-Miller, S. B., & Schacter, M. (2000). From restorative justice to restorative governance: Changing punishment at the turn of the century. *Canadian Journal of Criminology, 42*, 405-407.

Boland, B. (1998). Community prosecution: Portland's experience. In D. R. Karp (Ed.), *Community justice: An emerging field* (pp. 253-278). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bonta, J., Wallace-Capretta, S., & Rooney, J. (1998, October). *Restorative justice: An evaluation of the Restorative Resolutions Project.* Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada. Retrieved June 27, 2002, http://www.sgc.gc.ca/epub/corr/e199810b/e199810b.htm

Bonta, J., Wallace-Capretta, S., Rooney, J., & McAnoy, K. (2002). An outcome evaluation of a restorative justice alternative to incarceration. *Contemporary Justice Review, 5*(4), 319-338.

Boyes-Watson, C. (2004). The value of citizen participation in restorative/community justice: Lessons from Vermont. *Criminology and Public Policy*, *3*(4), 687-692.

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

Braithwaite, J. (1999). Restorative justice: Assessing optimistic and pessimistic accounts. *Crime and Justice*, *25*, 1-94.

Bursik, R. J., & Grasmick, H. G. (1993). The use of multiple indicators to estimate crime trends in American cities. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *21*(5), 509-517.

Clear, T. R., & Cadora, E. (2003). *Community justice*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson.

Coates, R. B., & Umbreit, M. S. (1999). *Research & resources review: Victim offender mediation empirical studies*. St. Paul: University of Minnesota, Center for Restorative Justice & Peacemaking.

Community Justice Exchange. (2005, October). *Best practices recognized by the Community Justice Exchange: Austin, Texas.* Retrieved February 24, 2005, from http://www.communityjustice.org

Dyck, D. (2000). Reaching toward a structurally responsive training and practice of restorative justice. *Contemporary Justice Review, 3*(3), 239-265.

Dzur, A. W., & Olson, S. M. (2004). The value of community participation in restorative justice. *Journal of Social Philosophy, 35*(1), 91-107.

Dzur, A. W., & Wertheimer, A. (2002). Forgiveness and public deliberation: The practice of restorative justice. *Criminal Justice Ethics*, *21*(1), 3-20.

Forgays, D. K., & DeMilio, L. (2005). Is teen court effective for repeat offenders? A test of the restorative justice approach. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 49*(1), 107-118.

Galaway, B., & Hudson, J. (1990). *Criminal justice, restitution, and reconciliation*. Monsey, NY: Willow Tree.

Hines, D., & Bazemore, G. (2003). Restorative policing, conferencing, and community. *Police Practice & Research*, *4*(4), 411-427.

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. R. Clear (Eds.), *What is community justice: Case studies of restorative justice and community supervision* (pp. 61-86). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Karp, D. R., & Clear, T. R. (2002a). The community justice frontier: An introduction. In D. R. Karp & T. R. Clear (Eds.), *What is community justice? Case studies of restorative justice and community supervision* (pp. ix-xvi). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Karp, D. R., & Clear, T. R. (2002b). *What is community justice? Case studies of restorative justice and community supervision*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Karp, D. R., & Drakulich, K. M. (2004). Minor crime in a quaint setting: Practices, outcomes, and limits of Vermont reparative probation boards. *Criminology and Public Policy, 3*(4), 655-686.

Karp, D. R., Lane, J., & Turner, S. (2002). Ventura County and the theory of community justice. In D. R. Karp & T. R. Clear (Eds.), *What is community justice? Case studies of restorative justice and community supervision* (pp. 3-33). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Karp, D. R., Sprayregen, M., & Drakulich, K. (2002). *Vermont reparative probation year 2000 outcome evaluation final report*. Waterbury: Vermont Department of Corrections.

Kurki, L. (2000). Restorative and community justice in the United States. *Crime & Justice, 27,* 235-304.

Lemley, E. C. (2001). Designing restorative justice policy: An analytical perspective. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 12,* 43-65.

Lovell, M. L., Helfgott, J. B., & Lawrence, C. (2003). Narrative accounts from the Citizens, Victims, and Offenders Restoring Justice Program. *Contemporary Justice Review, 5*(3), 261-272.

Maloney, D., Romig, D., & Armstrong, T. (1988). Juvenile probation: The balanced approach. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, *39*(3), 1-63.

Maxwell, G., & Morris, A. (2002). Restorative justice and reconviction. *Contemporary Justice Review, 5*(2), 133-146.

McCold, P. (2003). An experiment in police-based restorative justice: The Bethlehem (PA) project. *Police Practice and Research, 4*(4), 379-390.

McCold, P. (2004). Paradigm muddle: The threat to restorative justice posed by the merger with community justice. *Contemporary Justice Review*, *7*, 13-35.

McCold, P., & Wachtel, B. (1998). Community is not a place: A new look at community justice initiatives. *Contemporary Justice Review, 1*(1), 71-85.

Morenoff, J. D., Sampson, R. J., & Raudenbush, S. W. (2001). Neighborhood inequality, collective efficacy and the spatial dynamics of urban violence. *Criminology, 39*(3), 517-559.

Peterson, R. D., Krivo, L. J., & Harris, M. A. (2000). Disadvantage and neighborhood violent crime: Do local institutions matter? *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *37*(1), 31-63.

Pranis, K. (1997). Peacemaking circles: Restorative justice in practice allows victims and offenders to begin repairing the harm. *Corrections Today, 59*, 72-76.

Reiman, J. (1998). *The rich get richer and the poor get prison: Ideology, class and criminal justice.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Roche, D. (2001). The evolving definition of restorative justice. *Contemporary Justice Review, 4*, 341-353.

Schiff, M., & Bazemore, G. (2001). Dangers and opportunities of restorative community justice: A response to critics. In G. Bazemore & M. Schiff (Eds.), *Restorative community justice: Repairing harm and transforming communities* (pp. 309-332). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Settles, T. (2001). *Community policing and community adjudication: Toward a theory of organizational co-evolution in criminal justice administration.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, UMI No. AAT 3036879.

Sherman, L. W., Strang, H., & Woods, D. J. (2000). *Recidivism patterns in the Canberra Reintegrative Shaming Experiments (RISE).* Canberra: Australian National University, Center for Restorative Justice, Research School of Social Sciences, Institute for Advanced Studies.

Strang, H. (2004). The threat to restorative justice posed by the merger with community justice: A paradigm muddle. *Contemporary Justice Review*, *7*(1), 75-79.

Texas Department of Criminal Justice. (2002). *Program guide: Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative*. Austin: Author.

Umbreit, M. S. (1994). *Victim meets offender: The impact of restorative justice and mediation*. Monsey, NY: Willow Tree.

Umbreit, M. S. (1996). *Information on research findings related to uniquely restorative justice interventions: Victim offender mediation & family group conferencing.* St. Paul: University of Minnesota.

Umbreit, M. S. (1997). *The impact of restorative justice: What are we learning from research*. St. Paul: University of Minnesota.

Umbreit, M. S., Coates, R. B., & Vos, B. (2001). The impact of victim-offender mediation: Two decades of research. *Federal Probation, 65*(3), 29-35.

Umbreit, M. S., Coates, R. B., & Vos, B. (2002a). The impact of restorative justice conferencing: A multi-national perspective. *British Journal of Community Justice, 1*(2), 21-48.

Umbreit, M. S., Coates, R. B., & Vos, B. (2002b). *The impact of restorative justice conferencing: A review of 63 empirical studies in 5 countries.* St. Paul: University of Minnesota, Center for Restorative Justice & Peacemaking.

Umbreit, M. S., Coates, R. B., & Vos, B. (2004). Restorative justice versus community justice: Clarifying a muddle or generating confusion? *Contemporary Justice Review*, *7*(1), 81-89.

Van Ness, D., & Schiff, M. (2001). Satisfaction guaranteed? The meaning of satisfaction in restorative justice. In G. Bazemore & M. Schiff (Eds.), *Restorative community justice: Repairing harm and transforming communities* (pp. 47-62). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Van Ness, D., & Strong, K. H. (2002). *Restorative justice*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Weitkamp, E. (1998). The history of restorative justice. In L. Walgrave & G. Bazemore (Eds.), *Restoring juvenile justice* (pp. 75-102). Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Welsh, B. C., & Farrington, D. P. (2005). Evidence-based crime prevention: Conclusions and directions for a safer society. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 47*(2), 337-354.

Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged. The inner city, the underclass and public policy.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wolf, R. V., & Worrall, J. L. (2004). *Lessons from the field: Ten community prosecution leadership profiles.* Alexandria, VA: American Prosecutors Research Institute.

Zehr, H. (1995). *Changing lenses: A new focus for crime and justice.* Scottdale, PA: Herald.

Zehr, H. (2002). *Little book of restorative justice.* Intercourse, PA: Good Books.

Michael J. Gilbert, PhD, is an associate professor of criminal justice at the University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA). His research interests focus on crime and delinquency, violence, white-collar and corporate crime, transnational corporate crime, corrections, prisons, criminal justice privatization, and restorative justice. Before joining UTSA in 1991, he had more than 20 years of experience in corrections and criminal justice as a manager, trainer, consultant, and researcher. He has served as an adjunct instructor and curriculum design consultant to the National Academy of Corrections and as a jail/prison consultant to the National Institute of Corrections on numerous occasions. He holds a PhD in public administration, with an emphasis in criminal justice, from Arizona State University.

Tanya L. Settles, PhD, is an assistant professor in the Criminal Justice Department at the University of Texas at San Antonio's College of Public Policy. She has focused her attention on criminal justice reform, the role of communities in this reform, and the boundaries between the formal control of justice systems and the informal control of communities. Specifically, she has examined the design and implementation of restorative and community justice reforms using a variety of research methodologies. She also studies and writes about the economic and social impacts of legal commercial gambling. She earned her PhD from the Graduate School of Public Affairs at the University of Colorado, Denver. Before relocating to south Texas to pursue an academic career, she gained extensive practice-based knowledge about justice policy conducting program and policy evaluations while employed by the state of Colorado, and she has more than 15 years in policing experience from the Denver, Lakewood, Parker, and Littleton, Colorado, police departments.