2003

Boot camps: An alternative sanction for better or worse

Angela Dawn Macdonald

BOOT CAMPS: AN ALTERNATIVE SANCTION

FOR BETTER OR WORSE

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

in

Criminal Justice

---

by

Angela Dawn Macdonald

December 2003

BOOT CAMPS: AN ALTERNATIVE SANCTION

FOR BETTER OR WORSE

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

---

by

Angela Dawn Macdonald

December 2003

[redacted] Approved by:

[redacted] 12-9-03

Dale Sechrest, Chair, Criminal Justice Date

[redacted]

Pamela Schram

[redacted]

Larry Gaines

ABSTRACT

Much has been written on correctional boot camp programming in the past 20 years. Though the topic seems thoroughly studied, there appears to be disagreement as to the efficacy of such programs. This analysis intends to determine how well studied boot camps are, why there is so much disagreement in the findings, and what impact, if any, boot camp programming has had in corrections.

Data were gathered from the NCJRS database. Of 320 available articles on correctional boot camp programs, 66 contained original, empirical data and were included in this analysis. Information was categorized in terms of types of study, types of camps, and topics covered in the research. Significant findings were noted.

Boot camp philosophy states that a combination of strict discipline, physical training, education, and treatment programs would facilitate behavioral change in offenders. Studies have found that boot camp's educational components can improve academic achievement Substance abuse treatment, while not a significant factor in reductions of recidivism, has shown promise. There have also been positive attitudinal changes found, but these have not translated into behavioral changes.

Behavioral modifications were hoped to reduce recidivism. Boot camp programs have not had any significant effect on recidivism rates. Boot camp proponents also believed the programs would facilitate reductions in prison crowding and costs. Studies have not shown any conclusive impact of the programs either on crowding or costs. This analysis can find no compelling reason to continue correctional boot camp programs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

From 1980 - 1990, federal prison populations rose 134% (MacKenzie & Piquero, 1994). The Departments of Corrections (DOC) is constantly challenged to do more with fewer resources (Allen & Simpson, 1992). To answer these challenges, the DOC has devised alternatives to traditional incarceration. One such alternative is the correctional boot camp program.

Correctional boot camps have gained a tremendous amount of support from the public in the past twenty years (Stinchcomb, 1999). This popularity is due, in part, to the need for correctional reforms since better alternatives are not available. The public's desire to reform offenders and save tax dollars has sparked political and administrative interest in finding more effective program alternatives. The correctional boot camp program is believed to be one such alternative.

Anecdotal accounts detailing the ineffectiveness of current boot camp facilities and potential detriment to young participants have surfaced in recent years. In response to these reports, public support for boot camps has faltered slightly. Empirical studies have also

provided a discouraging look at the effectiveness of boot camp programming. Though evaluation results have shown minimal, if any, impact on program goals boot camps continue to remain politically popular (Stinchcomb, 1999).

Boot camps are not going away. Both political and public sectors continue to view this program as a viable, quick fix solution for correctional issues. Correctional boot camps continue to prosper despite evidence suggesting that they do not work. Thus, administrators are challenged to continue evaluations of current boot camps and use the findings to alter programs and improve the likelihood of future success.

Boot camps are categorized as intermediate sanctions because they are less severe than traditional incarceration, yet more severe than probation. Intermediate sanctions have been created as an alternative to prisons and detention centers in an effort to combat overcrowding and the increasing costs to the DOC (American Correctional Association [ACA], 1995). Though success rates of these programs are disappointing, intermediate sanctions continue to receive justification and support from proponents in public and political arenas (Peterson & Palumbo, 1997).

Traditional military-style boot camps provide a regimented atmosphere of discipline that are believed to facilitate attitudinal and behavioral change in offenders (Peters, Thomas, Zamberlan, & Caliber Associates, 1997). Proponents of the programs expect these positive changes to extend beyond incarceration and into the offender's life outside of prison (Lutze, 1998). The idea that these programs can cause such dramatic changes appeals to the public. Judges like shock incarceration programs because they offer a sentence more intensive than probation but less severe than a conventional prison (Allen & Simpson, 1992). Boot camps appeal to the correctional system, as a whole, because it is believed to reduce the costs and crowding of prisons by reducing the amount of time inmates spend incarcerated. Offenders are interested in these programs because they offer shorter sentences. Boot camps tend to lose their appeal upon closer inspection, as it quickly becomes clear that they are not achieving any of their goals.

Statement of the Problem

Correctional boot camps first appeared in 1983. In the past twenty years, there has been much written on boot

camp program effectiveness as well as literature citing or addressing various concerns. Though the topic seems thoroughly studied, there appears to be serious disagreement as to the efficacy of the programs. It seems no one really knows if these programs are useful or not. Continuing ineffective programs is a drain on the time, efforts, and resources of the DOC. On the other hand, if these programs show promise, research can indicate what aspects should be maximized to produce the strongest impact on stated goals.

Purpose of the Study

In the past twenty years, boot camps have been evaluated for effectiveness on reducing recidivism, crowding, and costs to the DOC. Program and offender characteristics have been studied. Programs have been scrutinized to determine whether they are harmful for participants. This study does not intend to add to this body of research. Instead, the author contends that there is enough information available at this time to determine the utility of these programs.

This analysis intends to determine how well studied boot camps are, why there is so much disagreement in the

findings, and what impact, if any, boot camp programming has in corrections. Three major questions will be addressed in an effort to synthesize this information in a clear, concise manor:

Research Question 1: How and why have boot camps evolved since their inception?

Original boot camp programs were modeled after military boot camps. Participants spent most of their time on drill and ceremony exercises. Recent boot camp models, on the other hand, incorporate more treatment programs. It is the intention of this study to determine specifically how camps have changed in the past two decades and what acted as a catalyst for change.

Research Question 2: How has research on boot camp programs changed over time in terms of focus, findings, and amount of research completed?

A preliminary search of the literature indicates that early research in boot camp programming is mostly anecdotal and descriptive in nature. These studies yield vague data on the effectiveness of programs. This analysis attempts to detail what improvements, if any, have been made to research designs in this area and determine if the research has been exhaustive.

Research Question 3: Of the available literature, what tangible findings exist on boot camp effectiveness in reducing recidivism, cost, or overcrowding?

The grumbling in corrections suggests that shock incarceration programs, known as boot camps, are simply another panacea in a long line of failed quick fixes for crime control. Yet these programs continue. According to the literature, is there any reason to further utilize these programs? This study will attempt to synthesize the available findings to determine if boot camps have, as a whole, been found to be an effective correctional alternative to incarceration.

Theoretical Foundations

Boot camps have been built on the philosophy that strict discipline in conjunction with treatment programs would act as a catalyst for pro-social change (Lutze, 1998). Such changes would include maturity, positive decision making skills, motivation, self-esteem, and self control. It is hoped that these changes would lead to reductions in recidivism rates. If youthful offenders began to make better decisions and exercise self control, they would be less apt to engage in criminal activity.

This belief closely follows rational choice and deterrence theories.

Rational choice and deterrence theories rest on the premise that all actions and decisions are made by free will. Rational choice theory states that decisions are made by carefully calculating risks against the potential rewards of an action (Akers, 2000). Choice theorists argue that the decision making process can be manipulated by boot camps in two ways. First, the camps are believed to teach and foster positive decision making that would enable potential offenders to refrain from criminal activity. Second, it is believed that boot camps are unpleasant enough to increase perceived risk of deviant activity. Therefore, individuals will choose not to commit criminal acts in an effort to avoid punishment.

Boot camp proponents insist that this program has the ability to deter future criminal activity. The deterrence doctrine states that sanctions must be swift, certain, and severe to deter individuals from a deviant course of action (Akers, 2000). There is no evidence to support that these camps are any more swift, certain, or severe than traditional facilities. Even so, proponents of camps hope they act as both specific and general deterrents. The camp

acts as a specific deterrent if offenders released from the program choose not to recidivate. The camp also acts as a general deterrent when such an offender serves as an example to the general population, causing others to refrain from committing criminal acts for fear of punishment.

Shock incarceration programs such as boot camps appeal to the criminal justice system. The underlying assumption for corrections is that rigorous programming would act as a specific deterrent, increase positive self esteem, and have a rehabilitative effect on offenders (Salerno, 1994). Treatment programs, education, and specific deterrence are expected to reduce recidivism. Reductions in recidivism can occur if boot camps have a positive effect on criminogenic behaviors (MacKenzie, Wilson, Armstrong, & Gover, 2001).

Limitations of Study

This study is hampered by the ambiguity plaguing much of the literature. In several instances, the methodology of studies was not explained. Data sets were often left out of reports making further inspection impossible. In several instances, data in different articles came from

the same data set. Many of these reports were completed by the same authors and were similar in methods, focus, and findings. This made it difficult to categorize studies. It is possible that some reports were categorized as repeats and omitted when, in fact, they were only similar to other studies. It is also possible that some were believed to be originals and, therefore, repeated in this analysis. Another limitation is that readers are being asked to trust that the appropriate articles have been used in this study and that they have been analyzed and interpreted correctly.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the early 1980s, concern over the trends in crime caused public opinion to shift from a rehabilitative to a militaristic correctional philosophy (ACA, 1995). Taken at face value, boot camps appear to be a perfect answer to the public's conflicting feelings toward customary crime control. The general public's hope is that correctional programming will deter future crime, rehabilitate prior offenders, and gain retribution (Wright & Mays, 1998). The main goal of correctional programs, such as boot camps, is to cause people to refrain from deviant or criminal acts. Failing that, the public wants criminals to be "fixed" or rehabilitated so they do not continue on their path of deviant activity. When nothing else seems to work, the public would like to be assured that the offender is punished for his or her actions.

This is not to say that correctional boot camps were conceptualized purely to placate the public. Intermediate sanctions were largely created in response to rising confinement costs and overcrowded correctional facilities (MacKenzie & Piquero, 1994). Boot camp programming has become one seemingly viable alternative to spending

millions of dollars constructing new prisons (Jones, 1996). "With growing disaffection toward customary crime control policies, many citizens and public policy makers have concluded that conventional sanctions have failed to control crime (Wright & Mays, 1998, p. 71)." Both politicians and the public view boot camp programming as an appropriate option for incarceration They view the camps as a way to address the apparent lack of discipline and self control in nonviolent, youthful offenders (MacKenzie & Piquero, 1994).

The first boot camps, as we know them today, began in Georgia and Alabama in 1983 (ACA, 1995). They offered shortened sentences for a small percentage of those incarcerated. The camps focused on both military style training and rehabilitative treatment programs. Intended targets were young (under 25), non-violent offenders (Allen & Simpson, 1992).

These camps were based on the Outward Bound, Shock Probation, and Scared Straight programs (Salerno, 1994). Outward Bound was a program in the early sixties that focused on changing juvenile behavior by improving self-esteem through physical activity. Shock Probation is a program that would amend an offender's sentence to

probation within the first four months of confinement. Scared Straight Programs offer juvenile offenders a visit to prison where inmates expound on the horrors of life behind bars. According to Salerno (1994), none of these programs has been successful in their behavior modification goals. Despite their collective ineffectiveness, these programs serve as a basis for modern shock incarceration programs such as boot camps.

Design and Operation

Specific characteristics determining whether shock incarceration is appropriate for an offender differ from one jurisdiction to another (Stinchcomb & Terry, 2001). The generally accepted criteria for candidates recommend that they be young, low-risk, non-violent, first-time offenders assigned to relatively short prison sentences. However, studies have shown that many of these participants are not low-risk, first-time offenders. Violent and repeat offenders have made their way into boot camps through relaxed criteria during assignment procedures. In some jurisdictions, the department of corrections offers shock incarceration to offenders meeting the criteria set up for that specific program

(Wiener, 1993). In other jurisdictions, offenders are sentenced to boot camp by judges at their trials.

In instances where judges sentence offenders to boot camp programs, eligible inmates are given the choice between serving their entire sentence or spending 3-6 months in boot camp (Wiener, 1993). The choice is hardly difficult. Yet, a large proportion of participants drop out or fail the program and return to their original sentence. Salerno (1994) contends that this is due to the coercive nature of the programs. He believes that participants cannot be considered volunteers, as there is no real choice between 3 months and 3 years of incarceration. What seems like a good decision loses its appeal once the harsh realities of camps set in. Offenders who are unable to cope with this reality drop out of camp or fail during aftercare.

Upon entry to the camp, program participants are immediately subjected to military drills and discipline (Wiener, 1993). They endure hard physical labor and exercise. Though programs differ, most offer some specialized training and educational services. Many provide rehabilitative services, such as counseling and substance abuse treatment. Proponents of boot camps

believe that a strict military atmosphere has the potential to facilitate permanent behavioral change in offenders (Peters et al., 1997).

Types of Camps

Virtually all boot camp programs were modeled after military basic training (Bourque et al., 1996). However, they differ in so many other ways that it is often difficult to categorize these camps. Programming is not uniform among the camps. There are no standard policies or programs, and each camp is free to run as it sees fit. Programs differ in terms of participant characteristics, placement, length of stay, and capacity. The main difference in these programs is how much time is scheduled for military style drill and training as opposed to treatment and educational programs. It is these differences that help categorize programs as traditional, rehabilitative, and educational boot camps.

Traditional Military-Style Programs

Early camps were based on the traditional military boot camp practices of drill and ceremony. Participants were often expected to wear military-style uniforms, use military jargon, and follow military-style protocol

(Gowdy, 1996). They resided in spartan housing similar to barracks found in the military. Each day, participants were subjected to an exhaustive daily regimen of physical training, hard physical labor, drill and inspection (Gowdy, 1996). Strict discipline including summary punishments for behavioral infractions, was an integral part of the camps.

Juvenile camps did not appear during this period, as policy makers were unsure what effect the harsh nature of the programs would have on youth (Gowdy, 1996). However, proponents of the camps argued that punitive treatment would have a positive affect on adult offenders. They believed that offenders were lacking discipline that could be promoted through exhaustive physical activities and teamwork (Bourque et al., 1996). Upon graduation, these more disciplined young adults would have the skills necessary to make positive decisions and better control their actions. As preliminary results trickled in from the research community, boot camp practitioners realized that a military atmosphere might not be enough to permanently modify the behavior of offenders.

Educational/ Vocational Programs

There are few programs that focus strictly on education and vocational training. Most camps simply include these components as part of a larger program. Educational and vocational programs look different depending on the camp goals. Juvenile camps place a strong emphasis on programs to increase academic achievement in the areas of reading, language, and math. Some camps provide vocational training, while others offer GED courses.

The Herman Toulson Boot Camp Pre-Release Employment Program in Maryland attempted to help adult offenders remove barriers they may have had to employment opportunities (Truesdale, 1998). It was expected that the program would have a positive impact on employment rates. Unfortunately, there was no significant difference in employment rates between those that participated in the pre-release program and those that did not.

Camps offering an education component have seen positive results. The DOC for New York estimates that the average education level of participants in its program increased by 1 grade level in 6 months (Clark, Aziz, & MacKenzie, 1994). Similar gains in education have been

seen in other programs such as Rebound Camp Kenbridge (Tiedeman & Gray, 1998). Florida's Martin County Sheriff's Office Boot Camp was a 4-month long paramilitary residential treatment program for adults (Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, 1997). Its graduates' reading ability increased by 8 months, math skills went up 3 months, and language skills increased by 6 months. In a separate study on Bay County Sheriff's Juvenile Camp, Florida's Department of Juvenile Justice (1997) reports similar increases for its graduates. Reading levels increased by 1 grade and 2 months. Spelling increased by 1 grade and 8 months. Math scores went up 1 grade and 7 months.

Unfortunately, recidivism rates do not seem to be affected in any way by educational advances. Martin County's program had a 58% recidivism rate while Bay County's was only slightly smaller with 48%. This is likely the reason educational programming is a component of rehabilitative camps rather than a program in and of itself. Christenbury, Burns, & Dickenson, (1994) believe that educational components have had such positive results that it is imperative they be included in all boot camp programs.

Rehabilitation Programs

As programs progressed, and possibly as public sentiment shifted back from a more punitive to rehabilitative attitude, camps began adding treatment options. It was hoped that these programs would achieve success in reductions of recidivism rates, not yet realized in traditional camps. New York's shock incarceration program was one of the early programs to document a treatment approach (Clark et al., 1994). Drill ceremony, physical training, work, academic education and substance abuse treatment were combined in this approach. Through rehabilitative camps, such as Alabama's boot camp program, researchers and camp administrators have learned that treatment services reduce the chances of reoffending far more than any drill and marching done in traditional military style camps where treatment is absent (Burns, Anderson, & Dyson, 1997).

Substance Abuse Programming

Drug offenders have entered boot camps in increasing numbers (Benda, Toombs, & Whiteside, 1996). This population's proportionate growth is due to boot camp targeting of non-violent offenders. Many non-violent offenders are incarcerated for drug crimes, which is why

such a large proportion of boot camp participants are in need of substance abuse treatment (Cowles & Castellano, 1996). Some programs, such as LA County's Juvenile Drug Treatment Boot Camp, focus specifically on drug offenders. These camps lend themselves well to substance abuse treatment because they are residential programs with strict, disciplined military atmospheres that reinforce self-control over undesirable impulses (Benda et al., 1996).

Though drug offenders proportionately dominate camps there have been surprisingly few evaluative studies determining the impact programs have on this unique population. Cowles and Castellano (1996) conducted an in-depth survey on substance abuse treatment programs within boot camps. Their survey found that all responding programs consider substance abuse rehabilitation to be one of the most important goals of boot camp programming. All programs provided substance abuse education. Seventy-five percent of the programs surveyed offered treatment programs. Cowles and Castellano (1996) believe that adult boot camps are able to provide more opportunities for substance abuse treatment, in general, than traditional

facilities. The extent of this treatment differs from camp to camp.

Research indicates that the therapeutic community model is one of the most successful approaches to drug abuse treatment (Cowles, Castellano, & Gransky, 1995). Unfortunately, few of these environments exist in shock incarceration programming. This is especially true of camps with heavier focus on the traditional military structure (Cowles & Castellano, 1996). Individualized treatment, another model finding great success with drug offenders, is also rare in boot camps. Most correctional boot camp programming offers a multidimensional approach of education and peer support. Twelve-step programs are popular in the camps, as well.

Research indicates that, though the types of models used in substance abuse treatment are crucial to rehabilitation, the most important determiners for success are actually staff related (Cowles & Castellano, 1996). The quality and number of staff available to treat offenders are paramount issues in treatment. Participants are able to achieve greater success in treatment goals when a facility is staffed with numbers proportionate to offenders and when those staff members are well trained

and buy in to the philosophy of the camp (Cowles & Castellano, 1996).

Unfortunately, though boot camp programs are oriented toward substance abuse treatment, they are not seeing great success in keeping graduates substance-free in the long-term. The camps, it appears, are simply too short to have any long-term or permanent impact on its participants' drug habits (Cowles & Castellano, 1996). The short duration of the camps is not the only impediment to treatment. Inmate needs assessments are also proving problematic. Experts in substance abuse treatment agree that individual treatment plans are critical to success of the programs (Cowles & Castellano, 1996). Yet, assessment tools are not being utilized to create individual treatment plans for inmates. This would suggest inmates are not receiving the level of care they need.

Findings for boot camp impact on substance abuse are mixed. In Zhang's (2001) study on the LA County Juvenile Drug Treatment Boot Camp, there was no statistically significant improvement in drug use during follow-up. Similarly, Cowles et al. (1995) have found no significant impact of boot camp programming on substance abuse in the

camps they surveyed. They also found no significant impact of these programs on reductions in recidivism.

Anderson, Carson, and Dyson (1997) found that offenders with a history of drug use were more likely to recidivate than other offenders. This is an important finding as the offenses were likely drug related, though this was not specifically stated in the research. This finding is contradicted by Benda et al. (1996), who found that drug offenders had lower recidivism rates than those without drug related offenses. This would suggest that treatment received in the camps may have had a significant effect on the offenders' substance abuse. However, it must be noted that experimental research designs are practically non-existent for substance abuse programming in boot camps. For this reason, it is difficult to determine if the camp itself had any appreciable affect on substance abuse as opposed to some other factor.

Changes in Camp Programs

Since their inception, boot camps have been moving away from the military drill model and toward programs that emphasize education, treatment services, counseling, and aftercare within the community (OJJDP, 1997). For example, the Los Angeles County Drug Treatment Boot Camp

(DTBC) began with a strong paramilitary structure, but gradually became "less and less tough," deviating from the original design (Zhang, 2001). These changes are likely in response to research that found programs focused on physical training and labor, as well as drill and ceremony, had not had a significant impact on recidivism rates (Cowles et al., 1995).

Facilities focused on treatment have not been proven to have a significant effect on recidivism rates, yet they appear to be far more promising than their earlier counterparts (Cowles et al., 1995). Camps have experimented with different treatment programs including education, vocational training, substance abuse treatment, anger management, and therapy in an attempt to foster long-term behavioral change and reductions in recidivism.

STAR: A New Mutation

Trulson, Triplett, and Snell (2001) investigated a school-based boot camp called Specialized Treatment and Rehabilitation (STAR). This combined the efforts of public schools, juvenile courts, and the juvenile probation department to change behaviors of at-risk youth. This new type of boot camp illustrates the movement of the justice

system into schools for correctional purposes, rather than educational and prevention programs.

The STAR program is the newest mutation in boot camp programming. At-risk students are assigned to STAR by the juvenile court system. They are able to go to school, as they normally would and participate in additional treatment programs. This program hoped to keep juveniles involved in school, at their grade level, while limiting disruptive behaviors (Trulson et al., 2001).

Trulson et al. (2001) found positive effects of STAR on the classroom environment. In a participant survey, students stated that they were unlikely to get into trouble again in the future. This attitudinal change is believed to facilitate positive behavioral change. However, there was a 53% reoffense rate for these same juveniles, indicating that changes in perceptions do not necessarily translate into changes in actions. At this point, evaluators must beg the question, what are the program goals? Do camps aim to change offender feelings or change offender behavior?

Goals

Goals for correctional boot camps vary from program to program (ACA, 1995). They range from punishment-supported most by taxpayers, to rehabilitation-the desired result for boot camp administrators. The most cited goals are to reduce recidivism, crowding, and costs to the departments of corrections. Some programs' goals are unclear, even to the practitioners of the camps. This leads to opposing actions that reduce the effectiveness of boot camp programming.

At this time, there are no standard goals for boot camp programs. The goals, according to the OJJDP are deterrence, incapacitation, rehabilitation, punishment, and cost control (Peters et al., 1997). Rehabilitation and cost control are of highest importance to policy makers. Reducing the crowding in detention centers has also become a paramount issue in recent years. Most evaluations of boot camps deal with reductions in recidivism, overcrowding of detention centers, and cost (ACA, 1995; MacKenzie & Piquero, 1994; OJJDP, 1997). These will be discussed further in this analysis, as they are the three goals common to all boot camp facilities and are the most

frequently studied indicators of success for these programs.

Reductions in Recidivism

Boot camp intends to have a rehabilitative effect on participants. Treatment programs, education, and specific deterrence are expected to reduce recidivism. Reductions in recidivism rates can occur if boot camps have a positive effect on criminogenic behaviors (MacKenzie et al., 2001). Three correlates of criminal activity are antisocial attitudes, social bonds, and impulsivity. These characteristics are found to be associated with deviant behavior.

Characteristics of boot camps are not designed to strengthen or create social bonds. These facilities limit visitation, which may reduce social bonds. Boot camps focus, instead, on reducing impulsivity (MacKenzie et al., 2001). The military structure is intended to make youth think before they act. Practitioners hope anti-social attitudes will change when criminogenic needs are addressed. The facilities' treatment programs are geared toward making this happen.

Social bonds, impulsivity, and antisocial attitudes change during the course of ones' life. Life-course

theorists hypothesize that critical events can bring about these changes. Shock incarceration advocates believe that incarceration in boot camps is capable of being one such critical event. MacKenzie et al. (2001) compared the effect of boot camps and traditional facilities on these criminogenic factors. Their findings show that antisocial attitudes and impulsivity could change when youth had a positive perception of their environment. The results showed that the positive attitude was the predominant factor bringing about change. The type of facility had no real impact on criminogenic factors.

Researchers found only small changes in characteristics relating to delinquency upon completion of the camp. The findings suggest that boot camp facilities have a very limited impact on the futures of their participant's criminal activities.

While some programs have had success in reducing recidivism rates (Clark et al., 1994; MacKenzie et al., 1995), the overwhelming research indicates that experiencing boot camp by itself will not reduce recidivism (Allen & Simpson, 1992; Bourque et al., 1996; MacKenzie et al., 2001; Peters et al., 1997; Peterson, & Palumbo, 1997; Tyler et al., 2001). Though recidivism

rates have not decreased, they have not increased either. It should be noted that long-term studies are largely unavailable at this time. Assuming recidivism rates of boot camp graduates remain comparable with those paroled from traditional institutions, it is still possible that boot camps will have a positive impact on corrections in the areas of overcrowding and costs.

Reductions in Overcrowding

Shock incarceration advocates expect reductions in recidivism rates to have a large effect on the reduction of crowding in detention centers and prisons (MacKenzie & Piquero, 1994). These reductions would alleviate prison crowding because if offenders become rehabilitated, they would not return to criminal activities upon release. Therefore, they would not return to prison to take up space. As noted earlier, significant reductions in recidivism have not been realized. This has not had any real impact on the prison crowding situation.

Another way proponents believe boot camps could impact the crowding of prisons is to shorten sentences (MacKenzie & Piquero, 1994). Offenders eligible for intermediate sanctions would have a reduced sentence upon successful completion of the program. Shortening sentences

works because it frees up bed space while still offering sanctions to criminal offenders. However, if program participants are drawn from a population of inmates that would have been offered probation had intermediate sanctions not been available, the original target population will remain in detention centers awaiting available beds in boot camp (MacKenzie & Piquero, 1994). This is called "widening the net."

If shortened sentences are to have any real impact on prison crowding, there must be an adequate number of offenders eligible for the program who complete the program in a shorter amount of time than their original sentence (MacKenzie & Piquero, 1994). By reducing days spent in detention centers, correctional facilities can remove low-risk offenders from beds and make room for high-risk offenders that need to be there. The net reduction in days would be minimal if the program is long or if offenders must wait excessive periods of time to get into the program, thus impairing the impact of shock incarceration.

Reductions in Cost

Advocates of boot camp programming hope for a domino effect on goals. If recidivism was reduced, there may have

been a serious impact on prison crowding. If prison crowding were reduced, costs to the departments of corrections would surely have been lowered. This did not happen. In fact, there is very little information in the literature on costs of boot camp programs. Evaluations of their impact on cost have not been completed because the information is largely unavailable. Instead, researchers have determined what boot camps must do to be cost effective.

According to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, four conditions must be met to reduce costs (Peters et al., 1997). First, the target population must be made up of those who would otherwise be incarcerated. Second, the term of confinement must be significantly reduced. Third, program failures, in the form of dropout rates, expulsion, and post release failures must be minimized. Finally, boot camps should be designed on a larger scale to greater impact the population (Peters et al., 1997).

Shock incarceration is cost effective when compared to traditional detention facilitates. This would suggest that programs have the potential to impact cost. However, boot camp costs are an average of 10 times higher than

probation (Tyler et al., 2001). As long as participants are prison-bound before entering the program, a reduction in costs is possible. If net widening occurs, costs for each participant who would have otherwise received probation would increase tenfold.

Incarceration costs at traditional facilities are likely to change with major net decreases in population (Peters et al., 1997). This will occur as inmates are diverted from longer traditional sentences to shorter ones. If an offender's original sentence is so short that participating in the boot camp program lengthens his or her stay, costs will increase.

Boot camp failures and dropouts must be minimized. Once a participant is removed from shock incarceration, he or she will return to the traditional facility to complete the original sentence making time of incarceration even longer (Peters et al., 1997). When this occurs, costs are not reduced. Post release failures increase costs as an offender reenters the correctional system.

Boot camps must operate on a larger scale. To maximize cost reduction, vast numbers of inmates must enter the program (Peters et al., 1997). It is imperative that camps have the capacity to house these large numbers.

On the same note, large facilities must operate near capacity to have an appreciable effect on prison populations. Studies have not found significant reductions in cost resulting from shock incarceration.

Factors Affecting Goals

Net Widening

The most important factor in reducing prison crowding and costs is the populations from which offenders are drawn (MacKenzie & Piquero, 1994). Net widening occurs when program participants are drawn from a group that would not have been incarcerated had intermediate sanctions not been available (Allen & Simpson, 1992; MacKenzie & Piquero, 1994). In many instances, the goal of reducing prison crowding goes unrealized because intermediate sanctions, designed as alternatives to incarceration, have been used for offenders who would otherwise have received probation (MacKenzie & Piquero, 1994). If this happens, the number of offenders in prison increases.

When intermediate sanctions are available, judges may use their discretion to assign offenders to those programs when they would have otherwise been given a more minimal

sentence, such as probation. Shock incarceration, or boot camp, is intended to target prison bound offenders. Using this program for offenders who would otherwise not have been incarcerated is counter productive to the goals of reducing crowding and costs (Peterson & Palumbo, 1997).

On the other hand, correctional boot camp programs have become a symbol for the criminal justice system to strengthen social control (MacKenzie & Piquero, 1994). Those who advocate net widening argue the punitive and deterrent effects of the camps. They believe the increased social control will help keep the streets safer. This perspective conflicts with the goals of prison crowding and cost reduction (Petersen & Palumbo, 1997).

The predominant factor driving the reduction in a need for beds is whether the program is used for prisoners or probationers (MacKenzie & Piquero, 1994). Using beds for probationers not only takes up space that could have been used to reduce crowding in detention centers, it adds to the overall cost of corrections. If the goal of shock incarceration is to reduce prison crowding and costs, it is clear that participants must come from the prison bound target population.

Aftercare

Evaluations of boot camp programs indicated that discipline and training received in boot camps are only small components of what offenders need to make long-term adjustments to their behavior patterns (Stinchcomb & Terry, 2001). They key to the program's effectiveness is intensive, continued guidance and supervision in the community.

Programs offering treatment and intensive supervision in aftercare have shown modest success. In light of this knowledge, it is surprising that this analysis has found few programs with specifically targeted aftercare components. While nearly all of the evaluations mentioned some type of aftercare, most do not have the capability to provide the continuous and multifaceted support network needed once an offender is released back to his or her community (Morash & Rucker, 1996). Supervision provided to participants upon release is little more than probation, the same care those in traditional facilities receive.

According to a 1997 report by the OJJDP, "Continuity between the residential and aftercare phases of the boot camp experience is paramount (Peters et al., 1997, p. 9)." Returning re-socialized offenders to their pre-

incarceration environments without continuing guidance dooms them to failure (Stinchcomb & Terry, 2001). It seems that without around the clock surveillance and the strict regimen of the boot camp atmosphere, individuals revert back to old patterns of behavior (Bourque et al., 1996).

In 1995, the American Correctional Association published standards for boot camps. Interestingly enough, aftercare was not covered as a standard for the camps. This is unfortunate as this issue is vital to the success of correctional boot camp programs.

Offender Characteristics

There are typically five restrictions placed on eligibility of offenders to enter boot camp programs. They must be under 25 years of age. They must have committed only non-violent offenses, though some camps have relaxed these criteria. Potential participants must be considered low-risk offenders. They should also be sentenced to shorter sentences-typically around five years. Offenders also need to pass a medical examination proving that they are in good health and able to complete the physical requirements of the program.

It can be assumed that boot camps will work better for some offenders than others. Unfortunately, few studies

have focused on what characteristics make offenders good candidates for these programs. The few studies completed show that those with prior offense history have higher rates of camp failure than those without a prior criminal records (Jones, 1996; MacKenzie et al., 1995). Younger offenders may not be suitable candidates due to maturity issues (Benda et al., 2002). Research also suggests that offenders who were abused as children do not do well in the boot camp atmosphere (MacKenzie et al., 1995).

Drop-Outs and Revocation

Failure rates are important factors in determining boot camp success because when offenders return to prison, they increase crowding of detention centers and costs to the DOC. Zhang's 2001 study found that boot camp graduates and those released from traditional facilities have virtually identical failure rates. Prior criminal records is deemed to be the most significant predictor of revocations (MacKenzie et al, 1995; Zhang, 2001). In some cases, intense supervision promoted more technical violations (MacKenzie et al., 1995). This doesn't mean that inmates in intensive supervision programs commit more violations than others. It simply means they were in a situation where they were more likely to get caught. Drop

out and revocation rates must be minimized for boot camps to have an appreciable affect on goals.

Perceptions

Critics of boot camps cite concerns that these programs could create dysfunctional stress for participants. MacKenzie et al. (2001) and Zhang (2001) have determined that boot camps do not have any more detrimental affects on participants' stress or anxiety levels than traditional facilities. In fact, juveniles in boot camps had more favorable perceptions of their environments than youth in traditional settings (Lutze, 1998). They felt their environments were safer and more therapeutic.

Perceptions and attitudinal changes are believed to be a factor in boot camp success. Some argue that offender behavior will change as a result of positive perceptions and attitudinal adjustments (MacKenzie & Piquero, 1994). Though young offenders in boot camp became less anti-social and less depressed than youth in traditional facilities, recidivism rates were comparable (MacKenzie et al., 2001). This would indicate that attitudinal change has little to do with the behavioral modification possibilities of boot camps.

Research

When boot camps first began in the early 1980s, a surprisingly large proportion of these programs were designed without conducting feasibility studies or standardized policies and procedures to guide implementation (ACA, 1995). Vast amounts of the DOCs resources were put into these programs without knowing if they could possibly be effective. Offenders were sentenced to boot camps without addressing concerns of potential detrimental effects this extreme type of sanction could have on an individual. The few studies available were ambiguous and methodologically flawed. Over the years, researchers have sought to improve upon methods of earlier studies. Unfortunately, there are several impediments to boot camp research that are out of the control of scholars.

Impediments to Boot Camp Research

Most research on boot camp programming has been evaluative in nature. This type of study is crucial to the assessment and improvement of success for any program. However, many evaluations, especially the earliest studies, were poorly conceived with weak methodology. Most

of these flaws can be attributed more to boot camp characteristics than research methods themselves.

Program characteristics create serious impediments to boot camp research. Cross comparisons of boot camps are problematic due to the variation in program components, staffing, length of stay, admission criteria, resources, record keeping, and definitions of terms such as recidivism. For instance, recidivism rates differ from one study to another (Tyler et al., 2001). This is because different studies use different definitions of recidivism. These rates might also vary depending on the population the programs are dealing with. Some camps take high-risk juveniles while others only focus on low-risk populations. Comparing or compiling these data can be difficult for researchers.

Goals of camps differ, which means that determinants of success for one camp will be different from that of another. The difficulty in evaluating boot camps, as a whole, comes from these diverse objectives. Determining the effectiveness of the overall boot camp concept has continued to be problematic in the two decades since they were first implemented in Georgia and Alabama. To avoid these methodological issues, researchers have chosen to

evaluate individual programs. Having diverse goals leads to diverse conclusions in the literature. Even so, most evaluations have been inconclusive in their findings (ACA, 1995; MacKenzie & Piquero, 1994); Peters et al., 1997).

The American Correctional Association published the *Standards for Juvenile Boot Camp Programs* in an attempt to remedy problems with evaluations and administrative issues. According to the ACA (1995), goal statements must be written in specific, measurable terms to be able to determine program effectiveness. Both short-term and long-term goals should be listed and evaluated. In this way, problems can be anticipated and solved methodologically. Programs must also maintain effective information systems that generate data needed for program monitoring, assessment, and evaluation. Information about the offender's progress in the program and through aftercare must be collected.

Current Research

While boot camps have been in effect for nearly two decades, there are few data from long-term studies (Tyler et al., 2001). It is possible that, while short-term findings have been discouraging, there may be some residual effect years down the line. The few documented

successes may also turn out to be only positive in the short-term. The only way to determine this is through longitudinal studies.

Research Designs

There are four basic types of research designs present in boot camp study: descriptive, theoretical, quasi-experimental, and experimental designs. While the majority of studies conducted are descriptive designs in the form of program evaluations, quasi-experimental and experimental research on boot camp programming have appeared in recent years. Unfortunately, these are still underrepresented in the literature. Explanations of the four research designs followed by examples of studies are included to illustrate various methodology and points of focus in current research.

Descriptive analysis.

Most research on boot camp programming is descriptive or evaluative in nature. Many studies combine these methodologies to give a clear picture of the camp's philosophies and its possible impact. Strong evaluations determine impact of camps and provide information that is intended to aid administrators in improving existing programs or correcting flaws in the boot camp philosophy.

Lutze's 1998 article comparing the rehabilitative potential of shock incarceration programs vs. traditional facilities is an example of a strong study that answered concerns posed by other scholars. This study showed that boot camps do, in fact, have supportive therapeutic environments. They do not seem to be detrimental to participants, though other studies warn about having participants who were abused as children take part in the camp (MacKenzie et al., 2001). Lutze (1998) also determined that though these camps have the appropriate environments, they are no more therapeutic than traditional facilities. Therefore, the utility of having two different programs that do the same things is questioned.

Studies, such as Benda, Toombs, and Whiteside's 1996 research on substance abuse and boot camp programs, address the changing needs of the offender populations. This particular study indicates that drug treatment programs can significantly reduce recidivism rates. Camps with no serious treatment program are not reducing recidivism of drug offenders. The proportion of drug offenders is rapidly increasing in boot camps. The need for substance abuse programs is intense. The results of

this study indicate that drug offenders have lower rates of recidivism and are in the community longer than those without substance abuse problems.

Anderson, Carson, and Dyson's (1997) article exploring the relationship between drug use and boot camp completion is a good example of poorly conceived research. The sample size in this example was far too small to be generalized to the population. A mere fifty graduates were used in this study. The findings, while not without merit, were hardly earth shattering. Success or failure of the program was not determined. The authors did find, however, that substance abuse and boot camp completion did not have a significant relationship. This information could prove useful in further studies.

Some studies are noteworthy because of their unique focus. Camp (1991) completed the only study included in this analysis that deals with issues facing boot camps' correctional officers. This study is important because it outlined implications for training needs. Well-trained staff will translate into better, more efficient camps.

Thompson et al. (1990) completed a study that proved to be unique from others in that it tested boot camp's physiological effects on the body. Their study measured

the effect that stress of boot camps had on testosterone levels. As expected, testosterone concentrations were shown to decline under stressful conditions and loss of social status. Their study shows that inmates who are most successful have a smaller decline in testosterone levels. This could mean that participants that are better able to handle stress would be more successful candidates for the program.

Theoretical models.

Theoretical models are used in boot camp research to predict the potential effects these programs have on attaining hard to study goals, such as reducing prison crowding and costs, when actual studies are impractical or impossible due to conditions outside the researchers' control. In boot camp research, these models are often used to predict success under a certain set of hypothesized conditions.

MacKenzie and Piquero (1994) developed an excellent model determining the effectiveness of boot camps on bed space. This model is not a good example of a camp evaluation. However, it seems to fulfill a greater purpose. The information provided leads to a better understanding of how to effectively administer the camps

themselves and the regulation process for participants entering the camps. This study provides facts needed to make appropriate decisions based on camp goals.

Quasi-experimental and experimental designs.

Because boot camps do not readily lend themselves to a true experimental design, diligent researchers have begun utilizing the quasi-experimental design to determine boot camp effectiveness. When researchers are not able to randomly assign subjects, they attempt to find a comparison group that is similar to the experimental group.

MacKenzie et al. (1995) completed a study on boot camp prisons and recidivism in eight states. This is one of the most noted quasi-experimental studies in the area of boot camps because it compared several camps, used different tools for evaluation (survey and official data), and used control groups. MacKenzie et al. (1995), included clear, methodologically sound research which echoed many previous research studies. This report pointed out the difficulties in evaluating boot camps. Control groups were used, which is something that hasn't been done enough in research on boot camps. However, there was a lack of consistency in the findings due to program differences in

camps. This meant that little information on the effectiveness of boot camps in reducing recidivism could be gleaned from this study, except to tell us what we already know. There is no significant impact of boot camps on recidivism.

Experimental designs, until recently, have been absent from boot camp research. This is not surprising as researchers do not have unlimited access to boot camp participants and inmates incarcerated in traditional facilities. Sheldon Zhang (2001) is one of few researchers able to reconcile the difficulties in assigning subjects to experimental and control groups in order to conduct such a study.

Zhang's study on the Los Angeles County Juvenile Drug Treatment Boot Camp used various measures to determine whether the treatment model was effective. It looked at many different definitions of success, not just recidivism rates. This study found no real significant impact of the camp, aside from reducing drug use among its graduates (Zhang, 2001). However, Zhang gave important insight into the research process and the obstacles facing researchers. This study also raised important questions as to the efficacy of boot camp programs in general.

Hundreds of articles have been written on the topic of correctional boot camps, 66 of which are used in this analysis. The authors of these articles tackled a topic fraught with obstacles to evaluation and study. Studies that used larger populations, detailed clear, concise methods, and used quasi-experimental or experimental designs were far more comprehensive in findings and focus than their counterparts and gave a much more clear indication of effectiveness. MacKenzie et al. (1995) and Zhang (2001) articles are examples of strong studies. Their evaluations were detailed and gave specific information on how the camp(s) was doing, as well as recommendations on how to improve these programs.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Much has been written on the topic of correctional boot camps. At first glance, there seems to be no real consensus, throughout the research, on the effectiveness of such programs. The literature is filled with descriptive and anecdotal evidence either supporting or refuting claims of success by policy makers. It is expected that an analysis of empirical, rather than anecdotal, studies would discover a common theme among findings. Due to the amount and variability of research available, the question, "Are boot camps effective?" may not be such a simple one to answer.

This investigation focused on research studies and evaluations of boot camp programs. The goal was to determine whether or not shock incarceration is an effective tool for corrections. This study also intends to explain how and why boot camps have changed over time, how and why the research has changed in the past two decades, and what empirical studies have learned about these programs' impact on stated goals.

Materials and Design

These data analyzed in this investigation came from the NCJRS database of research articles. Program descriptions and articles were limited to empirical evaluations, not literature reviews or editorials. Subjects were carefully scrutinized to avoid repeated or republished research.

Data Collection

Data were collected via four levels of searching. In the first, all abstracts concerning shock incarceration programs were downloaded from the NCJRS database. The search term used was "boot camp or shock incarceration." Three hundred twenty articles matched this query.

In the second level, all articles that were clearly not studies (i.e. editorials and program descriptions) were filtered out. At this point 170 articles remained.

In the third level, the remaining articles were analyzed to determine if any were repeated or republished. These articles were removed from the study. In the event of repeated or republished research, the most recent document was used, as it likely contained the most updated information.

Eighty-seven articles, in the fourth level, were downloaded in their full text version. Each was analyzed to determine which included empirical data. During this process, it was discovered that 21 of these contained repeated research. These were removed, leaving 66 articles for this analysis. These articles are designated in the reference section by an ampersand before the author's name.

Analysis

Data were gathered from the NCJRS database. Information was categorized in terms of types of study, topics covered in the research, and types of camps. Significant findings for each study were noted.

Among the research, there were four basic types of study: descriptive analyses, theoretical models, quasi-experimental, and experimental designs. Types of study were tracked by number and date. It was hoped to determine how the research methods changed over time. Descriptive data were collected from the articles themselves. These data included reasons for using a particular design, limitations of designs, and impediments to research.

In a further attempt to determine how research has changed over time, data were collected for the major topics covered in the studies. Topics include: substance abuse and programming, theoretical testing, psychological and attitudinal issues, education in the camps, correctional staffing issues, offender characteristics, net widening, aftercare, and community integration. It was also noted whether the study was an individual camp evaluation or multi-site study. Data on program effectiveness in terms of reductions in recidivism, crowding, and cost were also collected.

The type of camp was also noted. These data were broken into six categories: military, rehabilitation, military/rehabilitation, educational/vocational, drug rehabilitation or other. These data were used to determine how camps have evolved since their inception. Descriptive data, found within the literature, were used to determine why these changes occurred.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

All boot camp programs have been based on the paramilitary training model (MacKenzie et al., 1995). The degree to which camps have continued this philosophy has changed over time. Camps have been steadily moving away from the paramilitary structure toward a program-rich rehabilitative model since their inception in the early 1980s. Three main shifts in boot camp philosophy can be readily identified.

Correctional boot camps began as military boot camps would. They focused on physical training, drill and ceremony, strict discipline, and hard labor. These early camps did not include treatment programs. This military atmosphere was believed to provide the structure and discipline missing from offenders' lives (Austin et al., 1993). Evaluations were critical of the camps early on. Growing concern over minimal impact on identified goals and the punitive nature of treatment sparked a philosophical shift in boot camp programming.

Rehabilitative treatment and educational programs were gradually added to the camps.

This first shift appears to have begun with New York's shock incarceration program. This was the first documented attempt to emphasize a treatment approach (Clark et al., 1994). The military atmosphere continued to be the focus of the program, but rehabilitative programs began to take on a greater role. Treatment options were likely intended to supplement the program's hard core military regimen in an attempt to reduce recidivism.

The second shift occurred when research began to indicate that treatment options were showing more promise in allowing boot camp programs to achieve success than the punitive atmosphere of traditional military style boot camps had been able to achieve (MacKenzie et al., 1995). This shift moved the focus away from the strict drill and ceremony to educational and rehabilitative programs, counseling services, and substance abuse treatment. The military atmosphere was still present, but it had taken a back seat to rehabilitative efforts.

The third change, occurring still today, is a shift completely away from the military philosophy. Current boot camp programs barely resemble those of the past. This can

be seen in programs such as STAR. These programs illustrate how boot camps are moving into new areas, like schools and communities. This trend in boot camp programming may indicate that shock incarceration is likely to be phased out in the near future. At the very least, these programs are being altered beyond all recognition, and may no longer be considered "true" boot camps.

Research in boot camps was slow to catch up with the program's growth. The first boot camp began in 1983, yet the first complete evaluation was published in 1992. Evaluations of the original military-style boot camps are unavailable. All data presented in the literature reflects programs that include treatment and educational opportunities.

In the early 1990s, reports about boot camps began to trickle into the literature. Early studies were evaluative in nature. Methods were often inconsistent and flawed, though these flaws were mostly due to problems inherent in the camps. Early research focused on independent boot camp evaluations. Of the 66 reports included in this analysis, 49 are descriptive studies. Seven of these studies were theoretical models.

The amount of study boot camps received peaked between 1995 and 1997. Many of these studies attempted to reconcile problems in early evaluations. Larger populations were used. Studies became more detailed and began to report on more specific results. The first quasi-experimental design studying boot camps emerged in 1995. Experimental designs have only been used since 2001. Eight of the 66 studies utilized quasi-experimental research, while only 2 followed a strictly experimental design.

Boot camps appear to be well studied, yet of the 320 articles available in the NCJRS database, only 66 were found to contain original, empirical research. Most of these studies attempted to evaluate the impact boot camps had on reductions in recidivism, crowding, and cost. Thirty-one of the 66 articles evaluated the affect boot camps had on recidivism. These studies, overwhelmingly, discovered no significant impact on reducing criminal activities.

Ten of the 66 studies in this analysis attempted to determine whether or not boot camps were able to alleviate crowding in detention centers. These evaluations were unable to determine any impact on crowding. The majority of these cited the possibility of net widening as an

impediment to their reset. Yet, only 3 explored this concept further.

Cost was the focus of 12 articles. None of these studies were able to present clear findings on boot camp's cost effectiveness. Controlling for inconsistencies in accounting, hidden costs, information availability, net widening, and program failure rates was too difficult.

One other important factor studied was aftercare. Eleven research articles focused, in part, on aftercare and community integration procedures. All agreed that this was an important component not utilized to its fullest potential. Improvements in aftercare procedures were unable to be determined throughout the available literature. It is suspected that these program components still do not receive the attention and resources they deserve.

Interest waned after 1997. Focus continued to shift away from general boot camp evaluations to specific topics such as offender characteristics, religiosity, and substance abuse. As the camps moved toward to a more rehabilitative focus, research articles followed. Few camp evaluations are conducted today. Though correctional boot camps have been in operation for two decades, there have

been surprisingly few longitudinal or experimental studies conducted. Instead, boot camp literature has remained largely descriptive in nature and focused on short-term evaluations.

While some programs have had success in reducing recidivism rates, the overwhelming research indicates that experiencing boot camp by itself will not reduce recidivism (Allen & Simpson, 1992; Bourque et al., 1996; MacKenzie et al., 2001; Peters et al., 1997; Peterson & Palumbo, 1997; Tyler et al., 2001). There has been a lack of agreement on the significance of boot camps' impact on crowding and costs to the DOC, throughout the literature. It seems that boot camps have the potential to be an effective means of controlling prison crowding, though they are not having a significant impact at the present time. It also appears unlikely that the effectiveness in reducing costs will never be determined due to problematic record keeping and information sharing.

Offender perceptions and attitudes was not part of the initial focus of this investigation. Yet, this was the one area that previous research seemed to find continuous success for boot camps. It was generally agreed upon in the literature that boot camp participants perceived their

environments to be more positive and supportive than their counterparts in traditional facilities (Lutze, 2001; MacKenzie et al., 2001; Zhang, 2001). Positive attitudinal changes have also been found. While proponents of shock incarceration tout these statistics as a reason to celebrate boot camp programming, long-term studies on attitudinal change have not been conducted. There is also no indication that attitudinal changes translate into behavioral changes.

Discussion

Boot camps are continually changing in the hope of finding the right combination of discipline and treatment programs to have a significant impact on recidivism, crowding, costs, and behavioral modification. They have changed so much that current programs are barely recognizable as boot camps.

Boot camp programs can only be deemed a failed experiment that would not end. Since 1983, there has been no evidence to support the notion that these programs are successful in attaining any of their goals. They have had no impact on recidivism. There is no evidence to suggest that prison crowding has been alleviated. Quite the

contrary, boot camps are likely to increase crowding due to net widening and failure rates. It is unlikely that cost savings will ever be determined. Any positive changes caused by the camps, such as pro-social attitudes, have not been supported with longitudinal studies. There are simply no indicators of success available throughout empirical studies.

On the other hand, studies have not been able to prove that camps are detrimental to participants or the departments of corrections. There seems to be no harm in continuing these programs. However, does it make sense to follow through with a program that does not achieve any of its goals?

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The goal of this analysis was to determine how and why boot camp programs and research efforts have changed over the course of twenty years. More importantly, this analysis attempted to use available studies to determine the success of the overall boot camp concept. Studies were obtained from the NCJRS database. Of the 320 articles that matched the query, 66 were determined to be original studies including empirical data. These were used in the preceding analysis.

Every precaution was taken to ensure that all articles with original data sets were included in this analysis. Each report was carefully checked to ensure that it was not repeated in this study. Due to the subjective nature of this analysis, however, it is possible that some studies have been omitted, while others were duplicated.

This analysis synthesizes prior studies of boot camp programming to gain a clear, concise, overall picture of the effectiveness of the boot camp concept. It is hoped that policy makers may more attention to data gained

through sound methodical research than to pressure of politics and emotional anecdotal appeals from the public.

Boot camps were conceived as an answer to public concerns of rising crime, crowding in detention centers, and rising costs to the DOC. These programs are based on rational choice and deterrence theories. Proponents of the program believe that the punitive treatment in the camps will enable potential offenders to think twice before committing deviant acts. Treatment options are expected to help participants learn to make good decisions and ultimately modify their behavior so they won't reoffend.

This analysis found that while camps began with a strictly military-type structure, they quickly changed to a more rehabilitative philosophy. Research has indicated that treatment programs have a stronger affect on behavioral modification, leading to reductions in recidivism, than any component of traditional military camps. Today's camps have a strong foundation in rehabilitative and educational programs. Strict discipline, physical training and labor are still present, but these components are not emphasized.

Research findings were surprisingly consistent in evaluations of boot camps. These programs have not been

shown to have any significant effect on recidivism, prison crowding, or costs. In a very small number of studies, recidivism rates for boot camp graduates increased. On the other hand, a very small number of studies showed decreased rates for graduates. The overwhelming majority of findings have shown no effect, whatsoever, of boot camps on rates of reoffending.

Few of the studies exploring boot camp's impact on prison crowding were able to determine its effect on this issue. This is due to factors, largely, outside the control of evaluators. To compensate for this, theoretical models have been formed. They have shown that it is possible for boot camps to have a significant impact on reducing prison populations under a certain set of criteria. At this time, however, programs have not been successful.

While a few studies have examined potential cost savings due to boot camp programs, none have determined any effect because of accounting and record keeping issues. Attrition and net widening possibilities have also hindered study in this area. It is unlikely that boot camp programs have had any appreciable affect on costs to the DOC.

Boot camp programs have not been as well studied as it first appeared. Of 320 articles, only 66 were found to include original research. Much of the literature is comprised of republished reports, large studies broken into smaller ones, and reports with no identifiable research methodology. Most available reports have been independent camp evaluations. Problems with boot camp design make it difficult to compare camps or complete any meta-analyses of the findings.

The research community has been striving to improve methods used for boot camp evaluations. Quasi-experimental and experimental methods have been utilized in the past few years. Differing factors in camp design have been controlled for. After years of disappointments in achieving their program goals, study in the area of boot camps is unlikely to continue.

Conclusions

Boot camp programming has had no success in achieving its stated goals of reductions in recidivism, crowding, and cost. Any impact on participants, such as attitudinal change, has been minimal and not proven through longitudinal study.

While boot camps have lost the attention of the media and research communities, there are still many implications for further research. First, and most importantly, longitudinal studies must be conducted. While there has been no significant impact on reductions in recidivism, there may be some residual effects of camps ten and twenty years down the line. Research should also focus on quasi-experimental and experimental design. These studies could determine what specific characteristics of camps and offenders have positive or negative impacts on reoffense rates. Such research could have the potential to allow administrators to change programs in such a way that they may become successful in the future.

Recommendations

Findings from this analysis give no sound reason to continue boot camp programming. However, these programs are largely political and likely to continue, in some fashion, for quite some time. If programs are to be utilized, recommendations from the research community must be used to create an environment most likely to have an impact on stated goals.

First, record keeping from both in camp and aftercare must be standardized for all programs in an attempt to promote methodologically sound research evaluations. Standardized goals, and policies based on sound research, must be put in place for all camps. Camps should provide a therapeutic environment utilizing individual drug treatment plans for the large proportion of substance abusers incarcerated. Treatment options, along with educational and vocational components must be emphasized, as these have shown the most positive impact on offenders. A significant number of well-trained staff members must be available to implement these programs. Finally, an intensive, mandatory community based aftercare component must be implemented in all camps. The future of boot camp success will rely heavily on the research community to evaluate programs and advise administrators on ways to improve their facilities. Even so, the future of boot camps is in serious question.

REFERENCES

Akers, R.L. (2000). *Criminological theories: Introduction, evaluation, and application* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.

Allen, H.E., & Simpson, C.E. (1992). *Corrections in America: An Introduction* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

American Correctional Association. (1995). *Standards for Juvenile Correctional Boot Camp Programs*. Louisville, KY: American Correctional Association.

*American Institutes for Research. (1992). *Boot camps for juvenile offenders: Constructive intervention and early support: Implementation evaluation, final report*. Rockville, MD: Rutgers University.

*Anderson, J.F., Carson, G., & Dyson, L. (1997). Drug use and shock incarceration outcome. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 25*(1/2), 97-102.

*Anderson, J.F., & Dyson, L. (1996). Tracking investigation to determine boot camp success and offender risk assessment for CRIPP participants. *Journal of Crime and Justice, 19*(1), 179-190.

*Austin, J., Camp-Blair, T., Adams-Fuller, T., Jones, M.,

et al. (2000). *Multi-site evaluation of boot camp programs, final report*. Rockville, MD: The George Washington University.

*Austin, J., Jones, M., & Boylard, M. (1993). *Assessing the impact of a county operated boot camp: Evaluation of the Los Angeles County Regimented Inmate Diversion program*. Rockville, MD: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

*Benda, B. (2002). Religion and violent offenders in boot camp: A structural equation model. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 39*(1), 91-121.

*Benda, B. (2003). Survival analysis of criminal recidivism of boot camp graduates using elements from general and development explanatory models. *Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 47*(1), 89-110.

*Benda, B., Corwyn, R.F., & Rodell, D.E. (2001). Alcohol and violence among youth in boot camps for non-violent offenders. *Alcohol Treatment Quarterly, 19*(1), 37-55.

Benda, B., & Toombs, N.J. (2002). Religiosity and drug use

among inmates in boot camps: Testing a theoretical model with reciprocal relationships. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 35*(3/4), 161-183.

*Benda, B.B., & Toombs, N.J. (1997). Testing the deviance syndrome perspective among boot camp participants. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 25*(5), 409-423.

*Benda, B.B., Toombs, N.J., & Peacock, M. (2002). Ecological factors in recidivism: A survival analysis of boot camp graduates after three years. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 35*(1), 63-85.

*Benda, B.B., Toombs, N.J., & Whiteside, L. (1996). Recidivism among boot camp graduates: A comparison of drug offenders to other offenders. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 24*(3).

*Blanchard, D.K., & Perlstien, G. (1995). *Program evaluation of the Oregon Summit boot camp program.* Portland, OR: Portland State University.

*Bottcher, J., & Isorena, T. (1994). LEAD: A boot camp and intensive parole program: An implementation and process evaluation of the first year. Sacramento, CA: California Department of the Youth Authority.

*Bourque, B.B., Cronin, R.C., Felker, D.B., Pearson, F.R.,

Han, M., & Hill, S.M. (1996). *Boot camps for juvenile offenders: An implementation evaluation of three demonstration programs*. Rockville, MD: US Department of Justice.

*Burns, J., Anderson, J.F., & Dyson, L. (1997). What disciplinary rehabilitation unit participants are saying about shock incarceration. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 13*(2), 172-183.

*Burton, V.S., Jr., Marquart, J.W., Cuvelier, S.J., Alarid, L.F., & Hunter, R.J. (1993). Study of attitudinal change among boot camp participants. *Federal Probation, 57*(3), 46-52.

*California State Department of Corrections. (1997). *Alternative sentencing program, evaluation report*. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Corrections.

*Camp, D.D. (1991). Shock incarceration in Georgia: An analysis of task performance and training needs among corrections officers. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 16*(3/4), 153-176.

*Camp, D.A., & Sandhu, H.S. (1995). Evaluation of female

offender regimented treatment program (FORT). *Journal of the Oklahoma Criminal Justice Consortium, 2,* 50-57.

*Christenbury, N.J., Burns, J.L., & Dickenson, G.B. (1994). Gains in educational achievement by inmates during the Arkansas prison boot camp program. *Journal of Correctional Education, 45*(3), 128-132.

*Clark, C.L., Aziz, D.W., & MacKenzie, D.L. (1994). *Shock incarceration in New York: Focus on treatment.* Rockville, MD: US Department of Justice.

Cowles, E.L., & Castellano, T.C. (1996). Substance abuse programming in adult correctional boot camps: A national overview. In D.L. MacKenzie, Ph.D. & E.E. Hebert (Eds.), *Correctional boot camps: A tough intermediate sanction* (pp. 207-232). Rockville, MD: US Department of Justice.

*Cowles, E.L., Castellano, T.C., & Gransky, L.A. (1995). *Boot camp drug treatment and aftercare interventions: An evaluation review.* Rockville, MD: US Department of Justice.

*Delaware Statistical Analysis Center. (2001). *Delaware's adult boot camp, May 2001* (Publication No. 100208-010606). Rockville, MD: US Department of Justice.

*Ethridge, P.A., & Sorensen, J.R. (1997). Analysis of attitudinal change and community adjustment among probationers in a county boot camp. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 13*(2), 139-154.

*Florida Department of Juvenile Justice Bureau of Data and Research. (1996). Manatee *County sheriff's office boot camp: A follow-up study of the first four platoons*. Tallahassee, FL: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice.

*Florida Department of Juvenile Justice Bureau of Data and Research. (1997). *Bay County sheriff's office boot camp: A follow-up study of the first seven platoons.* Tallahassee, FL: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice.

*Florida Department of Juvenile Justice Bureau of Data and Research. (1997). Martin County *sheriff's office boot camp: A follow-up study of the first four platoons.* Tallahassee, FL: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice.

*Florida Department of Juvenile Justice Bureau of Data and Research. (1997). *Polk County sheriff's office boot camp: A follow-up study of the first four platoons.*

Tallahassee, FL: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice.

*Gauthier, A.K., & Reichel, P.L. (n.d.). *Boot camp corrections: A public reaction*. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice.

*Gover, A.R., & MacKenzie, D.L. (2003). Child maltreatment and adjustment to juvenile correctional institutions. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 30*(3), 374-396.

Gowdy, V.B., Ph.D. (1996). Historical perspective. In D.L. MacKenzie, Ph.D. & E.E. Hebert (Eds.), *Correctional boot camps: A tough intermediate sanction* (pp. 1-15). Rockville, MD: US Department of Justice.

*Holley, P.D., & Wright, D.E. (1995). Oklahoma's regimented inmate discipline program for males: Its impact on recidivism. *Journal of Oklahoma Criminal Justice Research Consortium, 2,* 58-70.

*Jones, M. (1996). Do boot camp graduates make better probationers? *Journal of Crime and Justice, 19*(1), 1-14.

*Jones, M., & Ross, D.L. (1997). Electronic house arrest and boot camp in North Carolina: Comparing recidivism. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 8*(4), 383-403.

*Jones, M., & Ross, D.L. (1997). Is less better? Boot camp, regular probation and rearrest in North Carolina. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 21*(2), 147-161.

*Kiefer, S.A., Olderman, J., Parker, K.L., Holbrook, D., Jr., Proctor, F., & Rambeau, C., Jr. (1995). *Preliminary evaluation of North Carolina's IMPACT program*. Rockville, MD: North Carolina Governor's Crime Commission.

*Lutze, F.E. (2001). Influence of a shock incarceration program on inmate adjustment and attitudinal change. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 29*(3), 255-267.

*Lutze, F.E. (1998). Are shock incarceration programs more rehabilitative than traditional prisons? A survey of inmates. *Justice Quarterly, 15*(3), 547-563.

*Lutze, F.E., & Marenin, O. (1997). Effectiveness of a shock incarceration program and a minimum security prison in changing attitudes toward drugs. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 13*(2), 114-138.

*Lutze, F.E., & Murphy, D.W. (1999). Ultramasculine prison environments and inmates' adjustment: It's time to move beyond the "boys will be boys' paradigm. *Justice Quarterly, 16*(4).

*MacKenzie, D.L., & Brame, R. (1995). Shock incarceration and positive adjustment during community supervision. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 11*(2), 111-142.

*MacKenzie, D.L., Brame, R., McDowell, D., & Souryal, C. (1995). Boot camp prisons and recidivism in eight states. *Criminology, 33*(3), 327-357.

*MacKenzie, D.L., Elis, L.A., Simpson, S.S., & Skroban, S.B. (1994). *Female offenders in boot camp prisons.* Rockville, MD: University of Maryland.

*MacKenzie, D.L., & Parent, D.G. (1991). Shock incarceration and prison crowding in Louisiana. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 19*(3), 225-237.

*MacKenzie, D.L., & Piquero, A. (1994). Impact of shock incarceration programs on prison crowding. *Crime and Delinquency, 40*(2), 222-137.

*MacKenzie, D.L., & Shaw, J.W. (1990). Inmate adjustment and change during shock incarceration: The impact of correctional boot camp programs. *Justice Quarterly,* 7(1), 125-150.

*MacKenzie, D.L., & Shaw, J.W., (1993). Impact of shock incarceration on technical violations and new criminal activities. *Justice Quarterly, 10*(3), 463-487.

MacKenzie, S.L., Shaw, J.W., & Gowdy, V.B. (1993). An evaluation of shock incarceration in Louisiana. *National Institute of Justice: Research in Brief*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

*MacKenzie, D.L., & Shaw, J.W., & Souryal, C. (1992). Characteristics associated with successful adjustment to supervision: A comparison of parolees, probationers, shock participants, and shock dropouts. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 19*(4), 437-455.

*MacKenzie, D.L., Wilson, D.B., Styve Armstrong, G., & Gover, A.R. (2001). Impact of boot camps and traditional institutions on juvenile residents: Perceptions, adjustment, and change. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 38*(3), 279-313.

*Marcus-Mendoza, S.T. (1995). Preliminary investigation of Oklahoma's shock incarceration program. *Journal of the Oklahoma Criminal Justice Research Consortium, 2,* 44-49.

*McCorkle, R.C. (1995). Correctional boot camps and change in attitude: Is all this shouting necessary? *Justice Quarterly, 12*(2), 365-375.

Morash, M., & Rucker, L. (1996). A critical look at the idea of boot camp as a correctional reform. In G.S. Bridges, J.G. Wells, & R.D. Crutchfield (Eds.), *Criminal Justice* (pp. 466-474). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

*New York State Department of Correctional Services. (2002). *New York State DOCs shock incarceration 2002 legislative report, executive summary*. Rockville, MD: New York Sate Department of Correctional Services.

*Norris, M.P., Snyder, D.K., Riem, K.E., & Montaldi, D.F. (1996). Boot camp remedial education programs: Who benefits? *Journal of Correctional Education*, 47(3), 140-146.

*Parent, D.G., Snyder, R.B., & Blaisdell, B. (1999). *Boot camps' impact on confinement bed space requirements, final report*. Rockville, MD: Abt. Associates, Inc.

Peters, M., Thomas, D., Zamberlan, C., & Caliber Associates. (1997). *Boot Camps for Juvenile Offenders*. Washington DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Petersen, R.D., & Palumbo, D.J. (1997). The social construction of intermediate punishments. *The Prison Journal*, 77, 77-91.

Salerno, A. (1994). Boot camps: A critique and a proposed alternative. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 20,* 147-158.

*Shivley, M., Tengalia, R. Jr., & Knight, J.W. (n.d.). *Assessing inmate receptivity to a voluntary shock incarceration program.* Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice.

*Souryal, C., & MacKenzie, D.L. (1995). Shock incarceration and recidivism: An examination of boot camp programs in four states.. In J. Ortiz Smykla & W. Selke (Eds.), *Intermediate sanctions: Sentencing in the 1990s* (pp. 57-88). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Co.

*Stewart, P. (1998). *Special condition number six and analysis of net widening per special condition number twenty-one: Final progress report.* Rockville, MD: US Department of Justice.

Stinchcomb, J.B. Ph.D. (1999). Recovering from the shocking reality of shock incarceration: What correctional administration can learn from boot camp failures. *Corrections Management Quarterly, 3*(4), 43-52.

*Stinchcomb, J.B., & Terry, W.C., III. (2001). Predicting

the likelihood of rearrest among shock incarceration graduates: Moving beyond another nail in the boot camp coffin. *Crime and Delinquency, 47*(2), 221-242.

*Thompson, W.M., Dabbs, J.M., Jr., & Frady, R.L. (1990). Changes in saliva testosterone levels during a 90-day shock incarceration program. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 17*(2), 246-252.

*Tiedeman, K.I., Ph.D., & Gray, D. (1998). *Intermediate sanction juvenile boot camp: First annual evaluation of Rebound Camp Kenbridge: In response to chapter 914, acts of assembly, 1996*. Richmond, VA: Virginia Department of Juvenile Justice.

*Toombs, N.J., Benda, B.B., & Corwyn, R.F. (2000). Violent youth in boot camps for non-violent offenders. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 31*(3/4), 113-133.

*Toombs, N.J., Benda, B.B., & Tilmon, R.D. (1999). A developmentally anchored conceptual model of drug use tested among adult boot camp inmates. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 29*(1/2), 49-64.

*Trulson, C., Triplett, R., & Snell, C. (2001). Social control in a school setting: Evaluating a school-based boot camp. *Crime and Delinquency, 47*(4), 573-609.

*Truesdale, S.Y. (1998). *Impact assessment of the prerelease employment program, graduates of the Herman Toulson Boot Camp*. Baltimore, MD: Coppin State College.

Tyler, J., Darville, R., & Stalnaker, K. (2001). Juvenile boot camps; A descriptive analysis of program diversity effectiveness. *The Social Science Journal, 38*, 445-460.

*Virginia Department of Corrections. (1992). *Evaluation of Southampton Intensive Treatment Center*. Rockville, MD: Virginia Department of Corrections.

Wiener, E. (July 1, 1993). High attrition rates found at OJJDP-funded model boot camps. *Criminal Justice Newsletter*, 24, 5-6.

*Wright, D.T., & Mays, G.L. (1998). Correctional boot camps, attitudes and recidivism: The Oklahoma experience. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 28*(1/2), 71-87.

*Zhang, S.X. (2001). *Evaluation of the Los Angeles County Probation Juvenile Drug Treatment Boot Camp*. San Marcos, CA: California State University at San Marcos.