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ABSTRACT A statewide “Reparative Probation” intervention was evaluated in Vermont in which volunteers serve on local Boards and meet with probationers to negotiate a “reparative contract.” Our sample (n = 229) was drawn from the universe of Vermont volunteers who completed a 54-question instrument measuring perceived equity, efficiency, and reciprocity in the program. Subscales for the questionnaire showed alpha levels from .43 to .77. OLS regression results found that education, reported religiosity, political conservatism, length of time as a member of a Reparative Board, and number of cases managed as a Reparative Board member explained significant variation in volunteers’ perceptions of equity, efficiency, and reciprocity. We believe our results generalize to the universe of Vermont volunteers and provide a basis for replication in other samples.
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Even though an estimated 59 million persons engaged in some form of voluntarism in the U.S. in 2002 (Bureau of Labor Statistics [BLS], 2002), and an estimated 3,995,200 people were ordered to local, state, or federal probation (Bureau of Justice Statistics [BJS], 2003), there have been few published empirical approaches to the management of people, organizations, and processes in voluntarism to probation. During the same period, 59 million Americans over age 16 volunteered a median of 52 hours a year per person during 2002 (BLS, 2002). Consistent with the obvious human and financial value that could be fixed to U.S. voluntarism, we believe voluntarism initiatives in public policy on probation constitute an enormous, and largely untapped resource for U.S. correctional systems. Recently, however, increased attention has been given to alternative approaches to community intervention and voluntarism as methods to promote equity and efficiency in offender rehabilitation (Indiana Commission on Community Service and Voluntarism, 2001; National Archive of Records Administration, 2001; North Carolina Commission on Voluntarism and Community Service, 2002; National Voluntarism Initiative Joint Table, 2001). But since little ongoing attention has been given to the role of management of voluntarism in public policy on probation, we address some aspects of the growing need for knowledge here.

Parallel with the need for knowledge regarding voluntarism in offender rehabilitation has been a paucity of guiding principles for Social Work management of such interventions. Traditional Social Work efforts to develop social policy initiatives have relied too heavily upon neo-Maoist ideology that is not appropriate for the post-industrialist U.S. (Chatterjee, 1996, 1999). Our view is that Social Work interventions, including faith-based interventions and voluntarism initiatives in corrections, can only be effective in the U.S. by being moral in selection and evaluation of treatments. We therefore present some broad principles underlying a management approach to such Social Work interventions that we believe are consistent with Western cultural imperatives and the best available approaches to philosophy of science within Social Work. We think our approach will aid the development of community voluntarism in offender rehabilitation. As we have sought to satisfy some need regarding principles by which voluntarism in offender rehabilitation may be guided, we also believe this constitutes a valuable approach to the management of the social problem of offender rehabilitation. Ultimately, the purpose of this paper is to promote effective management of voluntarism in Boards of probation as only one approach to the management of offender rehabilitation.

Our view was that equity, efficiency, and reciprocity are principles of both effective Social Work interventions and restorative justice programs. We also believed that effective management of volunteers would evoke positive program evaluations along these three dimensions. Along with these guiding principles we believed would explain volunteer satisfaction we also expected gender, importance of religious faith, income, education, age, and conservatism of political views, as well as length of membership in the Reparative Board program and number of cases handled during program tenure, to predict variation in perceived program effectiveness. We found that different variables significantly predicted aspects of several self-report outcome measures. Implications of these results were considered.

CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATION

Karp, Bazemore, and others have developed a theoretical body related to the issue of voluntarism in offender rehabilitation (see Karp, Bazemore, and Chesire, 2004, for a review of this literature, as well as Barber, 1984; Bazemore, 1998; Bazemore and Umbreit, 2001; Christie, 1977; Clear and Karp, 1999; Eizioni, 1996; Karp, 2001, 2002; Karp and Walther, 2001; Peters, 1973; Zehr, 1990). While voluntarism in service of the rehabilitation of probationers has existed since the inception of probation in the U.S. in 1841 (Moore, 1987) the experience of voluntarism has received little attention. Available reports from volunteers suggest that voluntarism programs are both highly satisfying for volunteers and are capable of effecting positive change in offenders (Alford, 1997; Greenberg, 1988; Moore, 1987; Shields et al., 1983).

Several problems have been noted in the application of volunteer initiatives, including weak management of volunteer programs (Swart, 1983), tension between professional staff and volunteers, poor volunteer training, and the rejection of volunteer authority by offenders (Kraicikos and Crittenden, 1982). It is to be expected that transition into and out of the formal, professional culture of correctional systems would present challenges for unpaid, self-motivated volunteers (Chatterjee and Abramowitz, 1993; Grant and Little, In Preparation; Mintzberg, Ahlstrand, and Lampel, 1998; Schein, 1992). Management of solutions to social problems means managing the people, organizations, and processes involved in responding to a problem, and doing so in an equitable, efficient, and reciprocal way (Chatterjee, 1996, 1999; Chesire, Under Review; Kohlberg, 1981; MacMaster and Chesire, 2001).
Our theoretical foundation included a macroeconomic understanding of the position of Social Work interventions in criminal justice and the post-industrialist U.S. Marxist roots of some social policy formulations have never been appropriate for the development of social policy in post-industrial economies like the United States, Great Britain, and a few other European nations. He has suggested a new approach to social problems that assumes: certain cultures are conducive to wealth-building, only some cultures produce sufficient surplus wealth to support a welfare state and its programs, and social service programs in post-industrial economies like the U.S. can only find legitimacy through "particularistic allotments based on reciprocity" (1999, 179). While volunteers receive a number of intrinsic rewards from formal and informal supports.

The way we defined management of social problems is to say that management of social problems means to produce guides for interventions. We believe an extension of the approach to the "management" of social problems (Chatterjee, 1996) can occur through the systematic development of management techniques applied to the people, organization, and processes that administer, support, and direct Social Work interventions. We think it important to note that the way we define the interventions. We think it important to note that the way we define management of social problems does not include maintenance of existing problem levels in society since Social Work interventions, that is, interventions that foster lasting improvement in the human condition, can be legitimized in Western cultures only through service to the Western cultural imperative of reciprocity in outcomes from exchanges. Furthermore, our adaptation of the approach to management of social problems besides poverty implies that selecting and refining interventions based upon a principle of producing the best possible outcome for individual cases, suggests that the primary mechanism of social change in Western Social Work practice comes through being moral in interventions. The greatest risk inherent in this approach could be called Mill's fallacy (Wilson, 1999) wherein Mill made the error of assuming that laws for disciplines that attempt to describe the whole of society, for example, Economics and Sociology, should be derived from laws that attempt to describe its parts, for example, Psychology. A Physicalist approach to Social Work interventions is employed assumes that all things that exist are comprised of physical objects and avoids this risk (Chesire, Under Review).

In keeping with this view, we think that the problems surrounding the achievement of equity, efficiency, and reciprocity are likely the roots of problems in management of voluntarism initiatives in restorative justice. We also believe this because the intervention promises to promote conditions and values that benefit offenders, volunteers, communities, and even the correctional system in equitable, efficient, and reciprocal ways. Volunteers may be understood as cultural outsiders to local, state, and federal correctional systems and prone to experience problems in integration with the system and sometimes with management (Schein, 1992). We also expected that entrance into, work within, and departure from the highly regulated and professionalized organizations of the Vermont Department of Corrections (VDOC) could be challenging for volunteers who have learned customs, rituals, technologies, organization, values, and language that are very different from a correctional bureaucracy. Volunteers also give freely of individual work, an approach to interventions that fosters lasting improvement in the human condition, can be legitimized in Western cultures only through service to the Western cultural imperative of reciprocity in outcomes from exchanges. Furthermore, our adaptation of the approach to management of social problems besides poverty implies that selecting and refining interventions based upon a principle of producing the best possible outcome for individual cases, suggests that the primary mechanism of social change in Western Social Work practice comes through being moral in interventions. The greatest risk inherent in this approach could be called Mill's fallacy (Wilson, 1999) wherein Mill made the error of assuming that laws for disciplines that attempt to describe the whole of society, for example, Economics and Sociology, should be derived from laws that attempt to describe its parts, for example, Psychology. A Physicalist approach to Social Work interventions is employed assumes that all things that exist are comprised of physical objects and avoids this risk (Chesire, Under Review).
in criminal justice in specific, we believe that management of social problems begins with evaluation, collection, and synthesis of data from five sources. The five sources of data we relied upon were: (1) identification of a problem that can be verified as having reliability and validity for measurement among individual human beings, for example, physical indicators of the problem in people, (2) the economic position of the nation-state within which the problem may be identified, (3) indicators of local or regional social development, (4) selection of control systems or organizations available to coordinate an equitable, efficient, and reciprocal intervention, and (5) application of interventions or intervention systems likely to produce the best available outcome for individuals, small interest groups, or families, from among possible outcomes.

We developed and tested several models of causal order here based on two assumptions. First: problems in the rational balance between equity and efficiency in offender rehabilitation will manifest with particular acuity among volunteers employed by highly structured, professionalized, and divisionalized organizations (Mintzberg, 1993) like state and federal correctional systems. Second: past problems in voluntarism management can be better managed by focusing on aspects of the volunteers themselves, including perceptions of equity, efficiency, and reciprocity in the Boards.

Since qualitative analyses had already been conducted upon the Vermont Reparative Volunteers data (Karp, Bazemore, and Chesire, 2004), this paper extended those explorations by asking a new research question: Do demographic, individual difference, and participation variables explain significant variation in self-reports of experience, preference, and satisfaction among volunteers to community Boards of probation? This question meets the expectations that Social Work research in offender rehabilitation will address an extant social scientific need, an important social problem, and that the research will focus on the causal influences of social behavior upon individual development (Baumeister, 1999; Bohannon and van der Elst, 1998; Chesire, Under Review; Ekehamer, 1974; Millon, 1996; National Association of Social Workers, 1996; Plomin et al., 2001; Schein, 1992, 1996; Thyer, 2001; Thyer, 2002; Wegner, 2003).

Our approach focused on the presumed causal order (Davis, 1985) between variables measuring demographic, individual difference, and participation variables (predictors) and volunteers’ self-reports of views regarding Board participation (outcome variables). Independent variables are presented in Table 1 and Outcome measures in Table 2 (next section). Davis’ (1985) rules for the generation of hypotheses related to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Predictor Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of membership in Reparative Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you characterize your political views?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was your total household income before taxes last year?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your gender?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is religious faith (or spirituality) in your life right now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories for Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the highest education level you have completed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of cases (Ratio)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Attitudinal Outcome Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retributive attitudes toward offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive attitudes toward victim participation in restorative process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief that Reparative Probation model helped restore communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception that offenders were better off as a result of Reparative Probation model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported commitment to restorative justice principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception that Department of Corrections effectively managed the program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All items measured in Likert format. "Strongly disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Neither Agree nor Disagree = 3, Agree = 4, Strongly agree = 5"
causal order between "X" and "Y" are: "Y starts after X freezes, X is linked to an earlier step in a well-known sequence [influencing Y], X never changes and Y sometimes changes, X is more stable, harder to change, or more fertile [than Y]" (p. 16).

We hypothesized that eight independent variables would act as predictors within Davis' rules. It was assumed that demographic variables would act in causal fashion upon individual differences in self-reported preference and experience of Reparative Board participation because age, household income, education, and political preferences are more stable, harder to change, or more fertile than reported experiences of voluntarism. Similarly, gender (measured as reported biological sex, here) never changes and attitudes about voluntarism sometimes change. We also hypothesized that participation variables like length of membership in a Reparative Board and number of cases in which a volunteer participated would act in causal fashion upon experiences because (1) experiences of membership begin after entry into the Reparative Board has frozen, and (2) the experience of work necessarily precedes accurate reports of work experience, that is, X precedes Y in a step in a well-known sequence.

With this understanding we hypothesized that relationships would exist between predictors like age, gender, household income, education, reported religiosity, and political conservatism and variables measuring preferences, satisfaction, and perceptions of voluntarism within VDOC (H1: \( \text{H1}_1: \beta_{\text{age}} = \beta_{\text{income}} \)). Similarly, it was expected that participation variables like length of time as a member of a Reparative Board and number of cases managed as a Reparative Board member would also demonstrate relationships with attitudinal measures (H2: \( \beta_{\text{length}} = \beta_{\text{cases}} \)). Finally, we expected that observed relationships could be explained in part by tension between equity, efficiency, and the cultural imperative for reciprocity noted by Chatterjee (1999) and Chesire (MacMaster and Chesire, 2001). We also believed that observations of relationships between variables and explanations generated would aid program development of Reparative Boards within and outside Vermont.

**RESEARCH METHODS**

**Research Design**

The research design had as its purpose exploratory tests of hypothesized relationships using a number of variables as predictors (Table 1). This purpose is appropriate given the limited development of empirical knowledge about volunteers in restorative community justice. Sampling for this design consisted of a survey method in which all community volunteers actively serving on Reparative Boards in Vermont were solicited for input. Multiple independent variables were employed to predict multiple dependent variables through separate tests using multiple, that is, Ordinary Least Squares, regression. The design controlled for all non-random threats to validity from sampling, selection, and setting (Cook and Campbell, 1979) identifiable by researchers within the universe of Vermont Reparative volunteers. These data are comparable to any similar source on an entire U.S. state.

**Intervention**

Past voluntarism in correctional initiatives sometimes involved volunteer assignment menial tasks with few challenges and rewards. As an untapped resource, Bazemore and Umbreit (2001) and others (Cullen, 1994; Pranis, 1998) have noted that volunteers bring important knowledge and resources to corrections initiatives, including the ability to exercise informal social control and provide social support. Voluntarism in corrections is also understood to have the benefit of enhancing community "collective efficacy" in preventing and intervening in response to crime (Sampson, Roudebusch, and Earls, 1997).

The volunteer program was designed to operationalize principles of restorative justice programs, in part by asking the questions, "What harm resulted from the offense?" "How can the harm be repaired?" and "Who is responsible for the repair?" The present program employed community volunteers to meet with offenders to negotiate a restorative justice contract. Offenders were obligated to fulfill terms of the contract such as writing apology letters, paying restitution, or completing community service, as the probationary sanction. Reparative Boards can therefore be central to the achievement of probationers' rehabilitation, a process in which volunteers play a role that exploits some volunteers' real interpersonal and management skills, as well as informed supervision and teamwork with the correctional system. Volunteers completing our survey reported participating in a range of cases according to this basic format.

**Population and Sampling Method**

The design of the sampling here was strong in that an entire universe of subjects was sampled, capturing diversity among all potential
subjects within a state that is otherwise largely homogenous (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000). The universe of Reparative Board volunteers in the state of Vermont was relatively small \((n = 292)\), and was determined through volunteer rolls maintained by state-level administrators for the Department of Corrections. An agreement to survey the volunteers was reached between researchers, state-level administrators, and the Reparative Board Association (an organization representing the Reparative volunteers). Potential subjects were asked by letter from the researchers to participate in the study. No fewer than four follow-up phone calls were made to attempt to establish direct contact with potential subjects who did not immediately respond to the solicitation. In all, 51 members never completed the survey. Upon consent to participate, 12 members were selected in a pseudo-random fashion to pre-test the instrument. These sampling strategies were appropriate to the purpose of the study and were highly effective, as 78\% \((n = 229)\) of all Reparative Board volunteers returned questionnaires to researchers.

While it constitutes a substantial achievement to sample from an entire universe of subjects, an attempt to withdraw 10-20\% from a small universe for the purpose of pre-testing could easily have threatened internal validity of concept measurement and/or resulted in an unrepresentative sample that would defeat the exploratory purpose of the study (Cohen, 1987). For these reasons only a small pre-test sample \((n = 12)\) was obtained in order to test the instrument, in order to retain the largest possible sample from the universe of potential volunteers. The completed pre-test surveys were analyzed to aid development of valid items to measure theoretically significant concepts.

**Scale Development**

Questions were developed through consultation with community leaders, formalized into a large item pool, and selected items were administered to subjects who consented to participate in the study. The resulting item pool consisted of 94 items within 54 separate questions. It was estimated that the questionnaire would take about an hour to complete. Principal components and MLE factor analyses (Carmines and Zeller, 1979; Dunteman, 1989; Eliason, 1993), and reliability analyses (Litwin, 1995), were conducted on 54 questions, and detailed results of these analyses will be reported elsewhere (Chesire and Karp, In Preparation). Low developmental scale-alphas ranging from .43 to .77 were achieved for different indices within the test, given the developmental nature of research in this area. Our outcome measures were: (1) retributive attitudes toward offenders, (2) attitudes toward victim participation in the Reparative Probation model, (3) perceptions that programs effectively restored communities, (4) perceptions that offenders were better off under Reparative Probation, (5) reported commitment to a model of restorative justice, and (6) perceptions that VDOC managed voluntarism well. Outcome indices, number of items included in each index, and scale alphas are reported in Table 2.

**Statistical Analyses/Adherence to Statistical Assumptions/Missing Data**

Univariate percentages were derived regarding key aspects of members' experience of participation in the program and are presented in the "Results" section of this paper. Additionally, regression analyses were employed using a model of causal order that included eight independent variables to predict six dependent variables. Before MANOVA, LISREL, or SEM modeling of multivariate relationships could be conducted normal OLS regression entering variables in a stepwise fashion (Neter et al., 1996) was utilized. The method was appropriate given that dependent variables were ratio-level composites of ordinal items.

Regression diagnostics were conducted and the data were found to adhere to all assumptions of OLS regression (Berry and Feldman, 1985; Neter et al., 1996). Outliers and influential data in the dataset were considered using tests of studentized deleted residual values according to the Bonferroni test procedure (outlier Y values on residual/error measurement), Leverage Values, Cook's Distance, DIFits, and DIFBetas statistics. Only in the regression test of the theoretical model to predict the scale scores for a measure of retributive attitudes toward offenders were outlying "Y" values observed on 10 cases. These cases were included in the final tests of regression models as influence on the model was negligible, that is, < 2\% of variance was altered by exclusion. As disproportionately influential cases were not found, implications drawn from these results may be considered reliable for theory development.

**Missing Values**

SPSS 10.0 for Windows was employed for identification of cases with missing values and patterns of values (SPSS, 2003). Among eight independent variables, 28 cases contained missing values in response to one item, that is, roughly 10\% of the sample. Additionally, 44 cases had
values on independent variables wherein respondents selected “no answer,” or “not sure” among available responses on the questionnaire. To exclude cases with missing values and cases where respondents had selected “no answer,” or “not sure,” options provided in the questionnaire, the present sample would have reduced by 31%, eliminated valid data available from the same cases, and unacceptably compromised remaining data.

Responses that accounted for missing or “no answer” values occurred for questions related to numbers of cases participated in (n = 3), length of time working for Reparative Boards (n = 8), importance of religious faith (n = 17), total household income (n = 34), highest level of education completed (n = 5), ordinal values for age (n = 6), and political preferences (n = 14). Responses that accounted for “not sure” values occurred for questions related to importance of religious faith (n = 12) and political preferences (n = 8). We elected to implement the following transformations for a total of 72 cases: for cases that possessed missing values on individual items (n = 28) or “no answer” selected on some items (n = 32), we imputed the sample mean for missing item responses. For those cases who selected “not sure” as the preferred response on either of two items (n = 12), we coded “not sure” responses as “0” values on those ordinal scale items. Values were imputed for 119 responses to retain a sample of n = 229 for regression analyses.

Reliability of imputed means depends largely upon the strength of sampling in the research approach, which happened to be quite strong here. To the extent that readers appreciate that adaptations have been made where necessary to preserve valid data obtained from many respondents, we believe readers can reliably employ our results.

RESULTS

Univariate Analyses

We begin with the demographic portrait. Exhaustive exploratory data will soon be available elsewhere in qualitative format (Karp, Bazemore and Chesire, 2004) but some quantitative data deserve presentation here. As Table 3 shows, the volunteers tend to be white, older, well educated, and geographically immobile. The volunteers tended to be older, certainly older than probationers. The median age was 54, with 75% over age 45. The group was nearly equally divided between men and women and were nearly all white. These volunteers had remarkably high education and income levels, with the highest levels of education being completed by almost all respondents.

### Table 3: Demographic Characteristics of Reparative Board Volunteers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reparative Volunteers</th>
<th>VT Census 1990</th>
<th>National Survey</th>
<th>Reparative Probationers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70 (&lt;45)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 60</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 5 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 years</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(&gt; 10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; high school graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/professional</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$20,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>(0-25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=$20,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>(25-75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=$40,000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=$60,000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$80,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity/spirituality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of primary importance</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very liberal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very conservative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* VT census income is measured as <$0-24,999, $25,000-49,999, $50,000-74,999, $75,000-99,999, $> 100,000.
stable residential histories; two-thirds had lived in the area of the local Reparative Board for longer than 15 years. As a group these volunteers were also surprisingly well educated, with 42% having graduate or professional degrees. The group did show considerable variation in sex, income, religiosity, and political conservatism, however, as noted. Where available, the table also provides a comparison between the Reparative volunteers, the Vermont population, an earlier (1982) national survey of community corrections volunteers, and the population of Reparative Board probationers.

Multivariate Analyses: Results of Regression Tests

We hypothesized that eight independent variables would demonstrate relationships with different dependent variables, and found support for five of our hypotheses. Specifically, we hypothesized that age, gender, household income, education, reported religiosity, and political conservatism would act in causal order to predict several different dependent variables. Some support was found for some of these hypotheses. We found that age and gender did not demonstrate statistically significant relationships with any dependent variable. Other significant relationships between demographic and individual difference measures and dependent variables are noted below. Additionally, we hypothesized that participation variables like length of time as a member of a Reparative Board and number of cases managed as a Reparative Board member would also demonstrate relationships with attitudinal measures. Both of these variables showed some relationship to dependent variables here.

SPSS 10.0 for Windows was employed for regression analyses (SPSS, 2003). In each regression test reported here, eight independent variables were employed in a stepwise fashion. These variables differentially predicted variation in outcome variables at significant levels, though gender and age did not predict any variation in any outcome measure. Summarized results of regression tests are presented in Table 4. It is meaningful to note that all regression tests found a large, significant, non-random source of positive variation present in all relationships between independent and dependent variables here (see the significant positive "Constant" t-values listed in Table 4). Since demographic variables and some individual differences, for example, religiosity and political conservatism, were significant predictors of some outcome variables,
we may posit some ideas. Little variation existed within the sample in many descriptive measures (see Karp, Bazemore, and Chesire, 2004) but the challenge remains to pick apart the consistency of the non-random variation in this sample. Perhaps some stable individual differences not included in the regressions, for example, history of victimization by crime or relationship with a probationer, or even some organizational factors in the correctional system like experience of inclusion in the culture of VDOC, or even organizational variables within the Reparative Boards such as referral source for membership on a Board could held partialize non-random variation.

\[ H_1: \text{Prediction of retributive attitude toward offenders.} \]

The first regression applied our model of causal order to predict retributive attitudes toward offenders. In this model, Board members who heard a greater number of cases were less likely to hold retributive attitudes toward offenders \( (t = -4.016, p = .000) \). This may be a result of gradually adopting an attitude consistent with other Board members, a selective weeding process that eliminates Board members who hold retributive attitudes, or it may be a function of having developed greater tolerance for diversity among offenders from exposure to greater numbers. Somewhat predictably, a conservative political preference was positively associated with retributive attitudes toward offenders \( (t = 3.028, p = .001) \) that may reflect alliance with stereotyped political party attitudes toward crime, that is, more conservative individuals are thought to be "tougher" on crime and those associated with it. Or this finding may merely reflect greater personality conservatism, for example, individuals who report higher political conservatism may also be people who are less likely to take risks, rebel against, authority, or violate norms. While this model explained just 9% of the variation in volunteer attitudes toward retribution for offenders, it should be recalled that many hundreds of causes may fairly be said to influence individual behavior in any single observation, and that accounting for nearly 10% of the variation in a particular behavior is actually an impressive achievement (Plomin et al., 2001).

\[ H_2: \text{Prediction of volunteer perceptions of offender benefit.} \]

A second regression attempted to predict volunteers' perceptions that offenders were better off under the Reparative model \( (t = 3.287, p = .001) \). The question remains whether volunteers received more, or benefited differently, from the intervention than offenders or the correctional system, insofar as one could question whether or not more religious volunteers would be inclined to look more favorably upon any process that was more oriented toward individual involvement of community members, because of the clear benefits altruism offers to them. It is also very likely that more religious volunteers viewed the intervention more positively because the Reparative model functioned as a form of social control requiring probationers to consider harm done to others, a process that could elicit proclamations of contrition from probationers. Very different from religiosity, however, greater political conservatism was strongly associated with views that offenders were not better off under the Reparative probation model \( (t = -2.481, p = .014) \). For instance, one would generally believe that more politically conservative persons would be in favor of correctional programs that promote offenders to take personal responsibility and to repair harm to victims and communities. Therefore, one explanation of this relationship between political conservatism and more negative views of the impact of the Reparative model on probationers, could be that more conservative volunteers may not have viewed any new form of probation positively. On the other hand, one must also wonder if the relationship between religiosity and political conservatism is unique within the universe of Vermont Reparative Board volunteers. Political conservatism may not be as positively associated with greater reliance upon religion or spirituality among Vermont volunteers, so there could be distinct differences in other U.S. states or internationally. A relatively low R2 was reported here, but should be interpreted by guidelines for causal analyses of individual behavior mentioned earlier.

\[ H_3: \text{Prediction of belief that program restored communities.} \]

A third regression predicted volunteer beliefs that the Reparative model effectively restored communities. In this model, only political conservatism was a strong negative predictor of variation in beliefs that Reparative Boards restored communities \( (t = -4.061, p = .000) \). Political conservatism here may reflect a wider identification with the community group that relates negatively to a view that the Board system did not do enough to repair collective harm caused by probationers' crimes. An R2 explaining 9.9% of the variation in volunteer reports was found.
here. Religiosity also performed negatively in relation to conservatism in this model, and was a strong positive predictor of more positive views of Board effectiveness in restoring communities ($t = 2.5843, p = .005$). This is an important finding related to how correctional systems can better manage voluntarism initiatives in models of probation for a number of reasons. The strong relationships between political conservatism and religiosity and perceptions that the Reparative model effectively restored communities indicates that there was a close relationship between reported political views and perceptions of the model for Vermont communities. We discuss implications for management in the next section of this paper, but we think it is worthwhile to note that conservatism and religiosity can find unique importance in some parts of the U.S. that may not be replicated elsewhere.

**$H_5$: Prediction of positive attitude toward crime victims.**

A fourth regression attempted to predict positive attitudes toward participation of victims in restorative justice processes. In this model, greater education strongly predicted more positive evaluations of victim involvement in the Reparative Board model ($t = 2.911, p = .004$). Higher education may reflect an ability to view victims of crimes not only in terms of the role controlled by the offender, for example, seeing a victim only as a victim or rape, robbery, etc., or an ability to view victims as empowered members of a community. The observed relationship here was between higher education in a sample that was noteworthy for its very high mean educational attainment (see Table 3), therefore this observation may represent a general relationship between education and views on victim participation, or it may reflect a relationship between the views of “super-educated” persons within a sample of otherwise well-educated individuals. Since only 3.3% of the variation in this outcome measure was accounted for by our predictor variables, we are inclined to think that some other variables not included in the model could account for volunteer perceptions of victim involvement. For instance, higher education may reflect the positive influences of feminism and political liberalism so pervasive in higher education in America (Patai, 1998) that could shape volunteers views of victims of crime more positively in general, and also in the specific instance of correctional voluntarism.

**$H_6$: Prediction of positive evaluations of VDOC management of voluntarism initiative.**

A fifth regression was performed. Interestingly, greater length of time involved in the Reparative Board program predicted more positive evaluations of correctional system management of the voluntarism initiative ($t = 2.173, p = .034$). Conversely, greater numbers of cases was a negative predictor of perceptions that VDOC managed the Boards well ($t = -2.562, p = 0.011$). It is not clear whether or not these observations derive from separate relationships between individual differences, or if these opposing relationships reflect the operation of a third institutional variable in the correctional system. In other words, greater numbers of cases may predict lower evaluations of VDOC management because such volunteers reported higher commitment to restorative justice principles (see Table 4), and may have viewed the correctional system as more oriented toward punishment than reparation of harm. Similarly, greater length of time in the Reparative Probation model could predict more positive evaluations of VDOC management of the program because volunteers who are more positively disposed to the correctional system in the first place may participate in the program longer. Or a single institutional factor, for example, access to information regarding VDOC disposition of particular cases, might cause both lower evaluations of the system by those who participated in more contract negotiations, and higher evaluations of the system by those who were involved with the Reparative programs for a longer tenure. This model also predicted just 2.6% of the variation in evaluations of VDOC, probably in part because few questions were asked that related directly to volunteer transitions into and away from the correctional culture, therefore questions raised ought not be ignored.

**$H_7$: Prediction of commitment to restorative justice principles.**

A sixth regression attempted to predict reported commitment to restorative justice principles using our model of causal order. Consistent with earlier findings that conservatism was associated with greater retributive attitudes toward offenders and less positive attitudes toward victim participation in the Boards, conservatism was negatively associated with greater commitment to restorative justice principles ($t = -2.129, p = .034$). This remains somewhat perplexing to us, since political conservatism may generally be understood to be very interested in seeing offenders attempt to repair harm to individuals and communities (Diamond, 1995), it may be that organizational culture in the Reparative Boards, or the experience of contract negotiations with individual offenders may have repelled more conservative volunteers. Also, while political
conservatism would be expected to show an interest in offender reparation of harm, political conservatism may also incline some volunteers to disapprove of any change to existing modes of sanction/punishment in correctional systems even when the espoused values of the program are not inconsistent with conservative views. We did find that greater numbers of cases in which a volunteer participated was a variable strongly positively associated with greater commitment to restorative justice principles ($t = 1.941, p = .053$).

This may reflect a number of organizational processes, for example, greater exposure to diverse offenders or greater opportunity to witness the restorative justice principles of the Reparative model in action. Or this observation may reflect that individuals who participated in more cases held a greater commitment to restorative justice principles prior to entry into the Reparative Board model, and were therefore likely to reap more intrinsic rewards from the model. Finally, income was a positive predictor of greater commitment to restorative justice principles ($t = 1.964, p = .051$). This observation could very well reflect local processes prior to self-selection onto Reparative Boards, for example, word-of-mouth referrals between like-minded citizens could result in greater percentages of persons from higher socioeconomic strata within the Boards themselves. Or this relationship could describe an attitude deriving from greater wealth, that is, such volunteers may be in a social position to be more committed to restorative justice principles from a view that such principles are advantageous to individual interests. An $R^2$ of 3.8% was reported here, but these findings provide interesting points of departure for future intervention and research.

**Summary of Regression Findings**

Even though no regression model predicted more than 9% of the variation in our outcome measures, the difficulty in identification of significant predictors of individual behavior is noted once again. In our research, however, we think that interpretation of small $R^2$ values should be tempered by awareness that we have managed to identify at least one significant predictor of individual variation in each of six outcome measures. We have also managed to produce these results not within a single individual, but as results from tests upon over 200 subjects constituting the near-total universe of volunteers available for this sample. Small $R^2$ values should not be interpreted to mean that small findings, or findings of limited importance, have been derived when the subject under study are dynamic, fluid, measures of individual differences that have been obtained from near-universal sampling methods. Undoubtedly much variation in our outcome measures was not explained by our design, instrumentation, or statistical methods. When interpreting our results here, we ask that the reader bear in mind present technological limitations on instrumentation and testing in the study of individual differences.

We think it is important to iterate that all regression models demonstrated significant, non-random positive variation that was not accounted for by our model of causal order. This is represented by the “Constant,” column in Table 4, and demonstrates that more detailed analysis of organizational variables and variables measuring individual differences is likely warranted, since demographic variables such as household income, age, and gender were universally not predictors of attitudes toward the Reparative program. Enhancements to research to begin to understand the sources of this variation are discussed in the next section. The weakness of such demographic variables to predict important evaluative dimensions of volunteer experience should inform an understanding of the importance of organizations, processes, and individual preferences in the evaluations of voluntarism experience in the rehabilitation of probationers. Additionally, political conservatism was found to be a consistent predictor of some negative evaluations of aspects of the Reparative Boards, along with a positive predictor of retributive attitudes toward offenders. The operation of political conservatism across all models is likely to be complex, as this tendency among some volunteers can relate to a variety of possible attitudes that would predictably relate to dependent variables. Finally, variables measuring participation in the Reparative Boards, the correctional bureaucracy, and Reparative processes with offenders predicted variation in two reports of volunteer evaluations of the program.

These findings support the general approach to management of volunteers in this paper, that is, management of voluntarism is likely a dynamic process that involves fluid individual differences among volunteers, institutional culture within the correctional system, and interactions between volunteers and offenders that have a strong impact upon the volunteers themselves. These findings also suggest that the dimensions of Social Work intervention described by Chatterjee, Chesire, and others are central to the Reparative model of probation. Regarding the importance of equity in the Reparative model, one can see strong distinctions between how politically conservative individuals viewed victim participation in the Board process, beliefs that the Reparative model restored communities, and commitment to restorative justice principles. Volunteers who placed greater importance on religiosity or spirituality held...
more positive views of victim participation in Reparative Boards than those who did not, perhaps because individuals with more transcendent views of humanity are more likely to see victim involvement in the process of sanction for offenders as fostering equity.

Regarding efficiency, it was equally clear that important processes involved in the organizational culture of the correctional system, and perhaps within volunteer-offender relationships, were manifesting through perceptions that VDOC managed the program effectively. In terms of reciprocity from outcomes of exchanges, volunteers who were more politically conservative were more likely to see retribution as an aspect of a reciprocal relationship between communities and offenders, but volunteers who had participated in more cases were less likely to view reciprocity with offenders in a retributive fashion. Also regarding reciprocity, there existed a clear negative relationship between higher political conservatism perceptions that the Reparative Boards created better outcomes for communities, a finding that may be an extension of more retributive attitudes toward offenders or a relationship that existed in its own right. Further along a a dimension of reciprocity, individuals with higher education in a sample noteworthy for its high mean educational attainment viewed the Reparative model as more reciprocal, that is, as a model that generated better outcomes for offenders.

Our view is that the Reparative probation model was a well-planned, well-executed voluntarism initiative in the VDOC that demonstrated clear improvements in management and evaluation over prior efforts. Additionally, we believe that the model demonstrated strong promise for some volunteers, for example, more religious and more educated volunteers, as well as volunteers with longer tenure in the correctional system and volunteers who held stronger commitments to restorative justice principles, as a highly effective community justice intervention with perceived benefits for volunteers, offenders, and communities. The strength of the VDOC evaluation project also demonstrated the somewhat perplexing finding that individuals with more conservative political views, at least within the context of this sample of Vermonters, evaluated the program negatively in terms of its involvement of victims, ability to restore communities, and volunteer commitment to program principles. We will now present some ways we think that our findings in each of these independent-dependent relationships can aid program development and implementation, and the management of voluntarism initiatives in rehabilitation of probationers, and the management of the larger social problem of offender rehabilitation.

**IMPLICATIONS**

Our research asked the question: *Do demographic, individual difference, and participation variables explain significant variation in self-reports of experience, preference, and satisfaction among volunteers to community Boards of probation?* We found that education, reported religiosity, political conservatism, length of time as a member of a Reparative Board, and number of cases managed as a Reparative Board member explained significant variation in self-reports of experience, preference, and satisfaction among volunteers to community Boards of probation. Yet how can these results be applied to aid the management of voluntarism initiatives in corrections, and through the management of such initiatives in turnmanage the rehabilitation of probationers?

One might say that simple proliferation of Reparative Boards of probation will increase effectiveness of this approach, and might raise positive perceptions of restorative justice principles because this would simply increase social capital among the Boards and raise evaluations of Board performance and value (Putnam, 2000). We think collectivist approaches to social capital have failed because these approaches functioned primarily to strengthen existing relationships between culture and individual class position in the existing social hierarchy (see Ritzer on Bourdieu, 1996). Putnam (2000, p. 403) recognized this problem and suggests a number of “agenda” items by which collective action to enhance American social capital can be enhanced. Like “Mill’s fallacy” there is also the problem of “false consciousness,” that Social Work interventions must face (Robbins, Chatterjee, and Canda, 1998). As “Mill’s fallacy” represents fallacious reasoning from “part to whole” in social justice, false consciousness represents fallacious reasoning from “whole to part.” That is, Social Work interventions will not be effective in post-industrial nations if the interventions are founded upon fallacious whole-to-part reasoning toward individuals based on stereotypes of people in the U.S. or Great Britain (Giddens, 1993).

We have suggested that the primary mechanism by which collective action to manage social problems in the U.S. can be accomplished is through affirmation of a principle of reciprocity in outcomes from exchanges. We agree with Putnam (2000) that development of a post-industrialist culture in the U.S. that transcends social strata should be of paramount interest to social activists, including in U.S. correctional policy. We differ from Putnam here, in that we have developed a more concise and specific prescription for how a mature American culture can affirm its own unique Western roots as well as legitimize Social Work...
throughout society. Based on our view, we have relied upon general principles for the management of social problems, to identify how findings from this study could be applied to improve management of Reparative Boards of probation.

Since Marxist views originated outside the capitalist West, these views provide a useful reference for Western intellectual efforts. In our case, Marxist or neo-Marxist views have been particularly helpful to stimulate ideas by which community justice, and Restorative justice principles could be formulated into a workable voluntarism initiative in U.S. corrections. Unlike in non-capitalist nations, however, the welfare state is not a revolutionary device for social change in the post-industrial United States. In the post-industrial West, any redistribution of social, economic, or natural resources forms a control system that supports the existing state (Chatterjee, 1999). In the post-industrial West, a Social Worker can effectively intervene in any domain, for example, a nation, state or province, community, family or individual, only by promoting principles of equity, efficiency and reciprocity that are consistent with the Western cultural imperative of equity in outcomes from exchanges (Chatterjee, 1996, 1999; Kohlberg, 1981; MacMaster and Chesire, 2001). Social Work interventions can therefore only be effective in the post-industrial West by being moral in intervention selection and evaluation, and can guard against exploitation by relying upon a Physicalist professional ethic and epistemology (Chesire, Under Review).

The Vermont Reparative Probation Program exemplifies the community justice concept by offering a community-based corrections program that prioritizes restorative justice and makes extensive use of community volunteers (Karp and Clear, 2002). Management of these volunteers presents unique challenges including the management of relationships between volunteers and offenders, and between volunteers and correctional systems. An economic system that commodifies services like social support and social control may unintentionally devalue the services of volunteers who offer such commodities for without paid compensation. Unless there is an explicit dimension of the voluntarism initiative, the meaning of exchanges between volunteers, voluntarism managers (Kohlberg, 1981). Within this context, a volunteer can be understood to show respect for the rights of others because she organization, volunteers, and recipients must be explicitly defined and reinforced through multiple control mechanisms. This is the case because people who work “for free” in a post-industrialist society will be viewed as deviant unless a more localized culture acknowledges, explains, and supports the compensation that the unpaid worker receives.

So the pervasive organizational problem is one at the core of a voluntarism initiative in a divisionalized organization: it is a problem between the culture of an organization that relies upon exchanges that can be devalued through reference to the larger society (Mintzberg, 1993; Schein, 1992). We believe that devaluation of exchange with volunteers is clearly not universal in American society, as indicated by the staggering numbers of Americans known to volunteer each year. We do think that reliance upon the threat of force to maintain control necessarily pervades the culture of correctional system, but that this necessary aspect of culture reduces options available to managers to intervene to change organizational culture (Kohlberg, 1981). Most attempts to legitimize consensual exchanges with volunteers in corrections are likely to seem disingenuous or unstudied, given this pervasive element of correctional culture. This is a core problem in organizational culture given that it reflects or affects organizational mission, culture, values, distribution of effort, and systems of compensation (Schein, 1992).

Managers can change organizational culture through many avenues, including the tasks upon which managers work, employment practices, and methods to measure important problems and topics (Schein, 1992). The Vermont Department of Corrections and the Vermont Reparative Boards employed all these management techniques in the institution of the Restorative justice model. Managers may also change organizational systems, processes, and procedures to alter organizational culture, or organizational design, or organizational rites and rituals, to affect the meaning of exchanges between volunteers, offenders, and correctional systems (Schein, 1992). In management of complex systems, cultural changes are facilitated when the manager makes some latent aspect of the culture explicit rather than merely trying to force a normative change upon managers, employees, or consumers. In this sense, we recommend managers employ an aspect of both correctional culture and culture in the wider society that reinforces principles of equity, efficiency, and reciprocity in efforts to support volunteers.

The transaction-based morality associated with market-based decisions in economics, trade, and commerce, is one option available to voluntarism managers (Kohlberg, 1981). Within this context, a volunteer can be understood to show respect for the rights of others because she
needs the same respect in return (Kohlberg, 1981). A tool already in use in the Reparative model can be exploited to serve the organizational need to systematically institute values in voluntarism initiatives that acknowledge (and therefore seek to guarantee) the intrinsic rewards a volunteer receives for his/her efforts. The central element of the Reparative probation model, the contract negotiated by one or more volunteers and an offender on behalf of the probation system, can be used as the symbol by which correctional culture can be altered ever so slightly in relation to the voluntarism initiative (Schein, 1992). Consistent with a transaction-based morality only a single step above raw force as a principle of moral action (Kohlberg, 1981) we think that espoused values in corrections ought to emphasize that the time, social resources, and interpersonal skills given by volunteers is not provided “for free.”

As more politically conservative volunteers seemed to appreciate in our study, the price paid by society for the work that volunteers do in administration of the Reparative contracts is quite high, both in economic cost as well as human labor. The Reparative contract can be recognized as an instance of social contract (Karp and Yoels, 1999; Rawls, 1999; Robbins, Chatterjee, and Canda, 1998; Ryan, 1995) backed by the force of law and facilitated by unpaid service within the voluntarism initiative. Correctional officials including policy-makers, senior managers, and practitioners can emphasize the price paid by communities for the work being completed by volunteers to define Reparative contracts. Provided there is genuine institutional support for the initiative, we believe such efforts will strengthen norms and values that are used to interpret exchanges between volunteers and offenders, and volunteers and correctional systems. This approach allows Reparative Boards, volunteers, and the correctional system to acknowledge at least one reward that any volunteer can be said to receive: he or she works to obtain greater “freedom” for communities from the cost of crime and incarceration.

Our research suggested that some volunteers received intrinsic rewards from voluntarism in corrections that other correctional volunteers might not have received, that is, a sense of spiritual, moral, or intellectual value from voluntarism because of individual differences in value for religion, higher attained education, or commitment to restorative justice principles. The most troubling element derived from our research was that more politically conservative volunteers evaluated the programs negatively along multiple dimensions. We think that all volunteers may be said to receive an intrinsic reward that may still be given greater emphasis in the culture of correctional systems: the experience of service to a community that includes the offender but is not fully controlled by either the offender, the correctional system, or the volunteer herself, can be made explicit. The ability to give freely of one’s time, work, and social and interpersonal resources constitutes a type of “freedom” for communities from the cost of crime and incarceration (Sen, 1999). While this freedom may not be immediately available to offenders on probation it may become available once the Reparative contract is satisfied. Even though this particular community “freedom” brought about by the unpaid service of volunteers may not be available to offenders, it is a real reward to every volunteer. Life in a community that may feel a lower collective cost from crime and incarceration additionally benefits every volunteer and every offender. That every volunteer probably values this unique type of freedom for individual reasons has probably been a source of some discomfort in voluntarism initiatives since professional managers, offenders, and even other volunteers may be suspicious of motives for service or the unwillingness of some volunteers to delve into private motivations to undertake such challenging work without pay.

By giving explicit voice to values toward distribution of effort and systems of compensation that are shared by volunteers and correctional systems alike, the motivations of individual volunteers can be safeguarded as private for them. In a post-industrialist society, subtle definitions of what is “public” versus what is “private” are probably always going to be needed when intangible and abstract resources like social support are redistributed. In the present instance, the Western cultural imperative that gives legitimacy to Social Work interventions, that is, reciprocal outcomes from exchanges can be used to promote increased equity, efficiency, and reciprocity in correctional voluntarism. Simply put: communities pay a heavy human and economic cost for crime and incarceration. Community residents may perceive these costs in different concrete terms controlled in part by individual differences, for example, more politically liberal citizens may view the cost of crime and incarceration as falling more heavily upon offenders than upon themselves, while more politically conservative citizens may experience the cost of crime and incarceration as falling most heavily upon themselves or the community, rather than upon individual offenders. Despite individual differences in religion, political preferences, and levels of education the Reparative Board process allows community volunteers to experience a real form of “freedom” through community service.

While the service provided by volunteers may be unpaid it is by no means “free” or without cost, correctional voluntarism makes some
freedom from the cost of crime and incarceration possible in a society still struggling to find exactly this cultural release. The positive relationship between commitment to restorative justice principles and higher income found here emphasizes that wealthy individuals may seek to find freedom from the societal costs of crime and incarceration by devoting themselves to unpaid work in corrections. Through voluntarism initiatives like the Reparative Boards, an avenue to a certain type of freedom can be made available to probationers that would not otherwise be possible. In this sense, some hope of reciprocity exists in the outcome of exchange between the "freedom" received by volunteers and the possibility of "freedom" that a probationer can experience if the Reparative contract is satisfied. That a probationer might one day experience the exact freedom as the volunteer she negotiates with, or that because of a volunteer’s unpaid service the probationer can live in a society that feel as if the costs of crime and incarceration are better managed through the efforts of its volunteer citizens, is no small redistribution of social or interpersonal resources. Proposed enhancements to the way Reparative Boards are managed have focused on ways to change correctional culture to make some of the service mission of community volunteers explicit in the behavioral norms set for offenders, correctional employees, and for the volunteers themselves. We believe the adaptation of the correctional system to support a service ideal that all volunteers can affirm should make principles of Restorative justice and Reparative probation less politically divisive. These improvements to management techniques should in turn enable improvements in research and refinement of the Reparative probation intervention. Additionally, we think that a model of management that focuses upon personal projects of employees within organizations (Grant and Little, under review) could someday be used to enhance volunteer satisfaction in Reparative Boards and correctional voluntarism in general. The Personal Projects Analysis approach used there invoked social, personal, contextual, and temporal factors to encourage and measure individual interests in collective endeavors at a publishing company (Grant and Little, Under Review). There, dynamic individual differences related to personal projects of employees at work like the personal meaning of a project, creativity engaged through the work, commitment to a particular project, perceived importance of the tasks involved, organizational climate, supervisor support, amount of collaboration with other workers, conflict, work group size, and other factors, were measured before and after work completed on personal projects. At time intervals, subjects were also asked to generate multiple new personal projects for themselves that could be measured at later intervals. These authors found among 93 editors and staff in a that task significance, enjoyment from tasks, and the amount of creativity the project engaged from a subject were positive predictors of better job performance. These authors also found that early commitment to a project among individual employees significantly predicted positive supervisor evaluations of overall effectiveness in a workgroup. We do not think that results from this pilot study of Personal Projects Analysis in a for-profit corporate environment with paid employees will necessarily provide rules for management of correctional volunteers. We do think that the Personal Projects approach is a unique method by which correctional volunteers can be primed and supported to develop personal projects that relate to individual voluntarism by managers in the correctional bureaucracy. In this way, satisfaction with voluntarism for all individuals is bound to increase, and satisfaction with correctional administration could increase, as well. This could be added into any one of a variety of experimental models for future Reparative Board interventions, along with changes to management style that explicitly employed language and norms for equity, efficiency, and reciprocity.

With a model of intervention that consists of (X) and (X+) treatment modalities, and random assignment of Reparative Boards to one modality of treatment versus another, an experimental model of evaluation can be employed at the level of Boards of probation. Between treatment and control conditions, longitudinal evaluation in some variation on the "observation-intervention-observation" format (Cook and Campbell, 1979) should also be implemented. These longitudinal measures could evaluate individual differences on variables such as perception of probation, incarnation, and the correctional system, as well as perceived commitment to restorative justice principles, as well as collect demographic variables upon entry and data related to other outcome measures at some point in the natural process of the voluntarism initiative, for example, every six months or one year, or upon resignation as a sort of exit interview for volunteers. This approach would further embed the dimensions of equity, efficiency, and reciprocity in outcomes from exchanges into the voluntarism initiative and support the ongoing application of the initiative in the correctional system, as a procedure and process that exists independent of particular volunteers or Reparative Boards. Enhancements like these to the Reparative model and its evaluation also permit detailed analyses of the role of number of cases in which a volunteer has participated, and the length of tenure as a volunteer in the correctional bureaucracy, and what impact these variables...
have upon volunteer satisfaction with management of voluntarism initiatives by a particular correctional system.

Such design changes are necessary and to some extent the only ones permitted by the nature of the intervention, in order to continuously improve and evaluate improvements to the Reparative model of probation. A very high “Constant” source of positive variation was demonstrated in each regression model presented above, evincing that voluntarism initiatives in corrections are difficult to develop in ways that will be as valued by offenders and the correctional system as much as the initiatives are valued by volunteers. More difficult than even the management of social reciprocity between volunteers, offenders, and correctional organizations is the challenge presented to researchers who seek to evaluate interventions that exist only because participants highly motivated by intrinsic rewards want the programs to be available. Since enhancements to a voluntarism initiative could not very well be piloted through recruitment of subjects who were not sufficiently motivated to volunteer to such interventions, for similar reasons as the self-selected volunteers, these interventions may only practically researched by changes to the intervention type, research design, or sampling methodology. This was the last recommendation we imagined could improve the study of a Reparative model of probation: expansion of the intervention to multiple sites in multiple states or regions in the U.S., or to other countries. This recommendation comes with a caveat: if testing of the model is extended to countries other than those few largely post-industrial nations around the world, multiple sites for testing within those countries must be sought as well. This is because aspects of organizational culture that facilitate management of voluntarism initiatives in the Western, post-industrialist United States may not adequately facilitate voluntarism management in other economic, political, and cultural contexts.

We do think that international development of the Reparative model of probation, and continued enhancement of the delivery of Restorative justice principles through the Reparative model, is possible and advisable. We used five sources of data to identify sources of variation in the management of social problems. These sources of data were: (1) identification of a problem that can be verified as having reliability and validity for measurement among individual human beings, for example, physical indicators of the problem in people, (2) the economic position of the nation-state within which the problem may be identified, (3) indicators of local or regional social development, (4) selection of control systems or organizations available to coordinate an equitable, efficient, and reciprocal intervention, and (5) application of interventions or intervention systems likely to produce the best available outcome for individuals, small interest groups, or families, from among possible outcomes. The fifth source of data we used to manage the problem of rehabilitation of probationers through management of voluntarism initiatives was the identification of a Reparative probation model, and the subsequent identification of methods to enhance management of the intervention that were synergetic with core values of the wider society in which the intervention occurred. International distribution of a Reparative probation model need only systematically measure, that is, control, the first four sources of variation between countries and control the fifth source of variation within a country through multiple testing sites. Development of (X) and (X+1) models of Reparative Boards of probation for delivery in other countries can proceed using data obtained in the first four items listed above, as well as through informed definition of the service ideal shared by community volunteers to the correctional system.

We think that low R2 explained in various regression tests of causal order should not be cause for dismissal of these results. Causes of individual behavior are so numerous that identification of causes of significant behavioral variation between individuals is a very important contribution to this area of research. That these results have also enabled discourse and planning that can be used to enhance delivery of the best available model of voluntarism in probation further demonstrates the value of these findings. We believe that integration of the proposed enhancements into the language, rites, rituals, and procedures employed to manage voluntarism in Reparative Boards can also be extended to enhance management of voluntarism initiatives in corrections beyond the rehabilitation of probationers. This facilitates the best possible outcome from among available outcomes for all parties involved in correctional voluntarism, and should aid the management of volunteers by managers in corrections, as well as the wider needs in offender rehabilitation.
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