

# Boot Camps

---

---

An Intermediate  
Sanction

---

---

JAMES F. ANDERSON  
LARONISTINE DYSON  
JERALD C. BURNS

UNIVERSITY PRESS OF AMERICA®

179171

# BOOT CAMPS

---

---

## *An Intermediate Sanction*

---

---

**James F. Anderson  
Laronistine Dyson  
Jerald C. Burns**

PROPERTY OF  
National Criminal Justice Training Service (NCJTS)  
Box 6300  
Baltimore, MD 21240-0000

**University Press of America,<sup>®</sup> Inc.  
Lanham • New York • Oxford**

Copyright © 1999 by  
**University Press of America,® Inc.**  
4720 Boston Way  
Lanham, Maryland 20706


12 Hid's Copse Rd.  
Cumnor Hill, Oxford OX2 9JJ

All rights reserved  
Printed in the United States of America  
British Library Cataloging in Publication Information Available

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Anderson, James F.  
Boot camps : an intermediate sanction / James F. Anderson,  
Laronistine Dyson, Jerald C. Burns.  
p. cm.  
Includes bibliographical references and index.  
1. Shock incarceration—United States. 2. Criminals—  
Rehabilitation—United States. 3. Juvenile delinquents—  
Rehabilitation—United States. I. Dysón, Laronistine. II. Burnes,  
Jerald C. III. Title.  
HV9278.5.A53 1998 365'.34—dc21 98-38405 CIP

ISBN 0-7618-1256-3 (cloth: alk. ppr.)  
ISBN 0-7618-1257-1 (pbk: alk. ppr.)

™ The paper used in this publication meets the minimum  
requirements of American National Standard for Information  
Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials,  
ANSI Z39.48—1984



his book is dedicated to our parents and family who have given of themselves unselfishly so that we could enjoy a better existence. This book is a tribute to the many years of unending love, support, and encouragement that sometimes may have appeared unreciprocated.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Dedication .....	iii
	Foreword .....	v
	Preface .....	vii
	Acknowledgments .....	ix
CHAPTER		
I.	Introduction .....	1
II.	The History of Boot Camps in America .....	7
III.	Drug Use History and Shock Incarceration Outcome .....	25
IV.	What Disciplinary Rehabilitation Unit Participants Are Saying About Shock Incarceration: The Alabama Experience .....	33
V.	Do Attitudinal Changes Among Boot Camp Participants Predict Recidivism? .....	49
VI.	A Four Year Tracking Investigation on Boot Camp Participants: A Study of Recidivism Outcome .....	67
II	A Tracking Investigation to Determine Boot Camp Success and Offender Risk Assessment for CRIPP Participants .....	87
VIII.	Effective Aftercare Provisions Could hold the Key to the Rehabilitative Effects of Shock Incarceration Programs .....	97
IX.	Conclusion .....	111
	Glossary .....	121
	Index .....	145
	About the Authors .....	169

## FOREWORD

Of the social problems facing the United States in the new millennium, none is more frustrating or seemingly intractable, than crimes committed by young men and teenagers. One reason associated with this grim reality is that crime is, as Samuel Walker stated, not just a justice system problem, but rather, crimes committed by young men invite a discussion of other social problems that could influence criminality. These include racial and ethnic conflict; poverty; drug addiction; gangs; handgun availability; unemployment; social, political, and economic inequalities; increasing tolerance of violence; and concerns that critics and scholars share regarding the decline of moral values in western societies.

The effects of many social problems are handed to the criminal justice system. Policy-makers and the public they represent, often expect the justice system to quickly respond by solving problems that society and the community have failed to successfully solve. Law enforcement officials, usually at the front end of the justice process, are primarily concerned with keeping the streets safe. Their role ends once an arrest and investigation are concluded. The courts attempt to assign the proper sanction for those who are arrested. Though the correctional component of criminal justice is the least visible of the three, it is the one that carries the burden of creating and implementing long-term solutions to the problem of *criminals*, rather than *crime*, which is the primary area of concern of courts and law enforcement.

It is with this idea in mind that correctional officials designed boot camp prisons. Boot camps are one of the few correctional innovations in recent decades that have been warmly received by the public and policy-makers. It is probably the most visually appealing intermediate sanction created since the alternative to the prison movement began during the 1980s. Boot camps receive extensive media coverage and enjoy sufficient funding in many jurisdictions.

The academic community has responded with a plethora of research devoted to various aspects of boot camps. The number of technical reports and journal articles on boot camps are numerous. Given the attention to boot camps in other venues, it is surprising that so little has been done in the area of pooling this information into one substantial

volume, as Anderson, Dyson, and Burns have done here.

One salient area that is often neglected in discussions of boot camps is its place in a historical context. In Chapter Two, the authors provide the reader with that missing historical context. They also incorporate extensive discussions of the problem of drug abuse among boot camp participants, which is another ancillary social problem that has been passed on to correctional administrators. The authors address the "bottom line" issue of how boot camps impact recidivism, and examine measures taken by correctional officials to lower recidivism.

In some respects, boot camps have represented an example of the "ready-fire-aim," rather than the "ready-aim-fire" approach to policy-making. It can be argued that we leaped before looking with respect to boot camps by pouring money into such programs. Anderson, Dyson, and Burns's book provides us with the opportunity to stop and look before leaping any further. Those who read this book should be able to critically examine boot camps as correctional administrators continue to search for methods of dealing with the illegal actions of young men.

Mark Jones  
Assistant Professor  
of Criminal Justice  
East Carolina University

## PREFACE

This is the first academic book about boot camps, or shock incarceration programs. It addresses whether they (a) work as an intermediate sanction; (b) generate more harm than good; (c) prevent offenders from re-entering the criminal justice system; and (d) are cost-effective. The book follows a logical sequence beginning with the history of boot camps, perceptions of boot camps by participants, studies which analyze boot camp successes and failures and ending with a discussion on the future of boot camps. Though there are many other intermediate sanctions, this book discusses boot camps exclusively.

This book is unique because it addresses boot camps as a correctional program within the context of confinement and its effects on offenders in the free community. By devoting complete attention to this sentencing alternative, it is hoped that the reader will have an opportunity to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the boot camp phenomena occurring in the United States.

Often when boot camps are discussed in journals, little effort is made to present a thorough or accurate analysis of these programs. Not only is this text a single book devoted to boot camps, but it has several unique features to benefit the reader. At the end of each chapter, there are discussion questions and key terms which can be used in a classroom or seminar environment to encourage a complete analysis of the subject. Also, at the end of the text, there is a glossary offered for every key term listed at the end of each chapter. This unique service is offered to assist readers in their comprehension of boot camps and its relationship to other concepts of the criminal justice system.

This book is considered appropriate for and designed to give undergraduate and graduate students a clear understanding of this intermediate sanction, in general, but also to indicate the state of correctional treatment in America in particular. The book is also considered essential reading for policy-makers and politicians interested in defraying expensive correctional costs, and to judges who sometimes indiscriminately impose this sentence on offenders who might otherwise be better served by receiving some other punishment. Stated another way, the book could assist judges to make informed boot camp sentencing decisions. Furthermore, we believe that it is vitally important to students and citizens who are concerned about issues of crime to have a clear and comprehensive understanding of the concepts and theories of



punishments and the role of intermediate sanctions. The book endeavors to provide readers objective boot camp information before they (1) attempt to evaluate its utility; (2) assess its overall effectiveness; and (3) consider its place in criminal justice policy.

Without a clear idea of the rationale behind a boot camp sentence, it is impossible to understand the connections between this idea of punishment and its policy implications. This book, then, is a “bare-bones” approach to ideas of crime, offenders, punishment, and the human conditions that foster the need to implement criminal justice policies to reduce crime and accommodate offenders. Although the works of many authors are presented in this text, we are not necessarily concerned with how other researchers and theorists have presented their analysis of boot camp, but rather, we are concerned with using objectivity and methodological rigors to follow a logical framework which provides meaningful analysis of boot camps for the purpose of disseminating factual knowledge of shock incarceration. We believe that only when this occurs can other goals, such as bias-free evaluations be made and effective criminal justice policy implemented.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A project of this magnitude can never be undertaken without the help of many people providing guidance, support, and inspiration. As such, the authors of this book would like to express appreciation to everyone responsible for its successful completion. The first author of this work wishes to express appreciation in general to colleagues in the Department of Police Studies at Eastern Kentucky University for their unending show of support and constructive criticisms to enhance this scholarship. However, special thanks is given to professors Vic Bumphus and Bankole Thompson for offering daily words of encouragement, inspiration, and being generous in their criticisms. I especially thank my mentors and former professors (Drs. James W. Marquart, Steve Cuvelier, Walter Bennett, and Velmer Burton, Jr.) at Sam Houston State University who taught me to strive for knowledge and relentlessly pursue academic excellence and for providing invaluable criticisms on my dissertation of the CRIPP program.

The second author wishes to thank those who played a special role in the development of her writing career: Joe Bagnoli, Larry Pelfrey, Chuck Morgan, Andrew Baskin, Dr. Albert Assibey-Mensah, Harrison DeShields and Carl and Deborah Thomas for their prayers and support; Drs. R.K. Tucker and Carl Holmberg for helping me discover my love for research and writing; Dr. A. Hasani Stone II for introducing me to the "real" world of criminal justice and corrections; my coauthors for their never-ending devotion to complete this project; and most of all God, for all of the blessings He has bestowed upon me.

The third author expresses appreciation to his family Juanita, Mary Carroll, and Jay for providing years of encouragement and love. Moreover, special thanks is given to Dr. Sam and Ms. Lucy for being loyal friends and always by his side. Last, this work is dedicated to all boot camp participants who are continually trying to change their lives in the face of great odds. May their journey be one of discovery and ultimate triumph.

The authors would especially like to thank Joe Gambino for using his special talents in the completion of this project.

**This project was made possible by funding from the National Institute of Justice (Grant # IJ-CX-0034). The interpretation in this work are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official positions or policies of the National Institute of Justice.**

# CHAPTER 1

---

## Introduction

Boot camps emerged in the early 1980s as a viable alternative to traditional imprisonment. During this period, many states were experiencing economic strain due to overcrowding in their correctional facilities. By 1983, there were 36 states under court order or facing litigation because of overcrowding. However, in 1986, 46 states were being sued for prison overcrowding. Therefore, boot camps were embraced as a feasible opportunity to set aside prison space for hardened criminals. Those offenders who were not viewed as serious or threatening were sentenced to either boot camp or another intermediate sanction. Other programs that were used at this time included: Electronic monitoring; house arrest; super intensive probation; and regular probation. Offenders sentenced to intermediate sanction programs are those that judicial officials viewed as not yet serious enough for a sentence to prison, but at the same time are those who cannot be allowed to escape without some form of minor punishment. However, because of the latter premise, many intermediate sanctions are viewed as “net-widening” programs or an unnecessary exercise in state control over individuals. Some critics of the justice system charge that were it not for the existence of intermediate sanctions, offenders would simply be released after going before a judicial officer.

Intermediate sanction programs help save states millions of dollars each year by diverting offenders from long-term incarceration. As such, this permits states to defray the cost of short-term programs for less serious offenders instead of having to pay exuberant costs associated with long-term confinement in a traditional prison facility, where a one year sentence sometimes costs as much as \$21,000 per inmate. Thus, some intermediate sanctions function as temporary community supervision programs. Their strongest appeal is that they allow offenders to retain attachments with family members and employers since they are not removed from the community. This benefit is believed by many

correctional experts to negate large numbers of recidivism cases. Since offenders can retain their employment status and spend time with their families, they avoid family and economic disintegration. Despite this benefit being associated with some intermediate sanctions, the boot camp model might hold more promise.

The mid 1980s witnessed a dramatic increase in drug use and arrests in the United States. At this time, the criminal justice system experienced an influx of drug-related incarceration population. As a result, Congress reacted swiftly by imposing strict mandatory sentences on offenders possessing and selling certain types of drugs (especially crack cocaine). This would ultimately reshape the social composition of federal and state prisons in ways never before seen. However, because of the “get tough” approach on crime in conjunction with the “war” declared on drugs, the correctional system would be the most adversely affected by drug arrests. For example, in 1981 state and federal prisons increased by almost 20,000 beds with another 43,000 under construction. In fact, the number of prisoners increased from 410,000 in 1982 to 645,604 in 1989. Therefore, the correctional system would be forced to seek alternatives to long-term incarceration or prepare to spend billions of dollars building new jails and prisons, and hiring enough manpower needed for a growing inmate population.

The early 1980s witnessed the first boot camp programs erected in Georgia and Oklahoma. Soon other states followed their example and started creating boot camps that span from the West to the East coast. Correctional experts viewed these developments as part of a larger social movement that occurred between many states in their move toward getting tougher on crime and criminals and controlling criminal activity. Criminal justice commentators maintained that the social, political, and economic conditions were ripe for a paradigm shift away from a treatment approach that coddle criminals to a punitive model that held them responsible for their actions. For example, for much of the 1970s, the government spent hundreds of millions of dollars fighting the war on poverty. During this time, many rehabilitation and treatment programs were used in the area of correctional treatment. However, as time progressed, critics argued that these programs helped very little and failed to wipe out poverty and other problems that saturated the inner-city areas. Some critics even argued that these efforts failed miserably to impact serious change. Instead of reducing crime, poverty, and lawlessness, there were reported increases. Even respected politicians, including criminal justice and policy experts, such as Ronald Reagan,

Robert Martinson, James Q. Wilson, Charles Murray and Louis Cox, conceded that nothing worked for rehabilitating offenders and perhaps the best way to reduce crime and deter criminals would be to invoke severe punishment. Moreover, the failure of social scientists to isolate crime-producing factors may have ignited a conservative approach to processing law violators.

Since boot camps provide both treatment and punishment, they are popular among conservative and liberal legislators and citizens. Conservatives strongly advocate the use of strict discipline and pain associated with the boot camp experience. Moreover, they value the idea of authority figures (drill sergeants) confronting young offenders and rejecting the excuses that they give for their participation in crime. Conservatives hope that the boot camp experience will shock participants into the harsh reality of their crime and instill in them discipline, responsibility, and respect for law and order. Liberals, on the other hand, are attracted to the treatment and rehabilitation components (individual and group counseling). Furthermore, liberals feel that after participants are released from boot camp, they will have better opportunities since many often receive a GED and learn technical skills, which enable them to receive higher paying jobs. Moreover, they are pleased that these offenders are diverted from traditional incarceration since spending time in prison has an established association with becoming a hardened criminal. Liberals hope that boot camps will increase offenders' life chances. However, despite their differences, each group desires to see reductions in crime, reduced levels of recidivism, and less expensive correctional costs. While not a panacea for corrections, boot camps hold tremendous promise. This is true to the extent that President William Jefferson Clinton allocated two billion dollars for erecting more boot camps, research, and evaluations on the impact that they are having in corrections. As such, many contemporary boot camp studies solely target facility designs, operations, and staffing issues. Ironically, they ignore those who are most important in the process (participants) and place more emphasis on the operations and structures of boot camps. This book is a departure from governmental technical reports. Unlike previous boot camp studies, it takes on a more inclusive dimension.

Chapter Two explores the initial use of the military model in U.S. prisons to maintain discipline. Recently, correctional experts have revisited this approach to help alleviate the need for building more prison bed space and reducing expensive prison costs for hardened criminals. It will provide an expanded definition explaining what correctional boot

camps are and how they are intended to work. Moreover, some background information on all U.S. boot camps will be provided. An examination of the rationales and justifications surrounding each state's decision to implement this punitive treatment approach will be presented. Chapter Three argues that the Alabama boot camp, like many other programs, has especially targeted offenders with a history of drug abuse. The chapter will discuss evidence that indicates there is no significant difference between the completion rate of drug users and non-users. It considers that perhaps the ability for drug users to complete the program lies within the Twelve-steps that are intertwined in the Alabama program.

In Chapter Four, the authors use a qualitative research approach and contend that while boot camps are known for their rigorous regimen of marching, physical training, and hard work, Alabama boot camp officials have learned that additional services, such as individual and group counseling, will help improve probationers' chances of not reoffending when they are released. Moreover, officials at the Disciplinary Rehabilitation Unit have also discovered that by asking offenders what works, they can better treat and rehabilitate them. Chapter Five addresses whether reported attitudinal changes among boot camp participants mean that they will recidivate at a lesser rate following their release. This chapter relies on boot camp data collected over a four year period. It makes predictions on the offenders' commitment to remain crime-free after being released in Texas.

In Chapter Six, the authors focus on tracking the recidivism levels of 653 participants who have been freed for several years. This chapter provides the types of offenses that accounted for the participants' reinvolverment in crime and reveals demographic information about them. Moreover, it argues the need for boot camp officials to address specific problem areas that offenders will invariably face while on probation. This is designed to help ensure that participants have a successful reintegration into the community. Chapter Seven discusses boot camp participants who have been released for nearly two years, noting that the participants in the study were made up of a variety of offenders who had committed drug, property, and personal offenses. Research findings revealing criminal typologies of offenders who are most likely to recidivate, and perhaps pose serious threat to an already drained criminal justice system, are examined. This chapter provides information on the offenders who are at a higher risk of reoffending if they are placed in shock incarceration programs.

Chapter Eight will address the effectiveness of shock incarceration programs. More specifically, it examines the impact that boot camps are having in terms of meeting their goals of reducing crime, freeing needed bed space for hardened criminals, and reducing expensive prison costs for strained state correctional budgets. This chapter also addresses what correctional administrators and social service providers can do to make shock incarceration more effective. In the final analysis, this chapter will argue that quality aftercare programs hold the key to effecting positive change in boot camp participants. Chapter Nine examines the future of boot camps in the United States and addresses whether they will be short-lived or forever remain a part of correctional history.

### Discussion Questions

1. Explain why boot camps became such a popular option as an intermediate sanction?
2. What do boot camps provide that is new under the correctional treatment umbrella?
3. Why do critics of the criminal justice system sometimes view intermediate programs as “net-widening” programs?
4. Why do liberals and conservatives both endorse boot camps as an intermediate sanction?
5. What is meant by a diversionary sentence?
6. Why did the conservative model re-emerge in the latter 1970s?

### Key Terms

arrests  
boot camp  
community supervision  
    programs  
confinement  
conservatives  
conservative approach  
correctional facility  
court order  
criminal justice system  
diversion  
drug use  
electronic monitoring (EM)

“get tough”  
hardened criminals  
house arrest  
intermediate sanction  
judicial officer  
liberal approach  
liberal  
long-term incarceration  
net-widening  
offender  
prison  
prison overcrowding  
punitive model



recidivism  
regular probation  
rehabilitation  
severe punishment  
short-term programs

strict discipline  
strict mandatory sentences  
super intensive probation  
traditional imprisonment  
treatment

## **CHAPTER 2**

---

### **The History of Boot Camps in America**

Military training was first implemented in an American correctional facility in 1888 by Warden Zebulon Brockway at the Elmira Reformatory located in Elmira, New York. The military approach he introduced lasted until 1920. Brockway crafted this as a new training approach to invoke discipline and keep inmates active, rather than simply allowing them to suffer boredom and inactivity. This military training approach was functional at Elmira for several reasons. First, it saved the institution money by eliminating the need for hiring prison guards. Second, it helped to alleviate an emergency resulting from the abolition of inmate labor under “Yates Law” (Smith, 1988). Prior to Yates Law, it was difficult for “free” citizens in Elmira and other parts of the state to compete with prison industries. This was a reality since inmates labored free, worked day and night, and produced quality products that were less expensive than their competitors’ prices (Smith, 1988).

The new law prohibited inmates from competing in the open market. Yates Law necessitated that Elmira’s administrators discover viable ways to occupy inmates’ time since they could no longer engage in producing goods to be sold on the open market. The military paradigm was great for this need. The idea of using military training to discipline inmates and keep them orderly was considered one of the most innovative ideas of its time. During its highest moments, local citizens were often invited into Elmira Reformatory to witness prisoners march and perform military ceremonies. However, this approach to disciplining offenders plummeted by the end of World War I. When this occurred, Americans began to abhor the memory of the war and things associated with the military (Smith, 1988). This would mean an end to the military structure that was initially praised at Elmira. Some scholars contend that the implementation of the military training served its useful purpose during that historical period. During World War II and the post-war period, the

U.S. Army used intensive basic training as a strategy to rehabilitate and reform soldiers who committed criminal behavior. The army adopted this plan to reduce overcrowding at correctional facilities on military installations and to generate cost savings. Intensive military training allowed the Army to successfully return 42,000 soldiers to active duty (Lima, 1993).

### **The Forerunners to Boot Camps**

In 1965, a forerunner to boot camp was developed in Ohio. Shock probation attempted to “shock” inmates into changing their behavior after a brief incarceration period (90-180 days or longer) followed by probation. Correctional experts believed that shock probation would teach offenders to be law-abiding after they were given a “taste” of prison. These experts thought that this approach would have a deterrent effect on criminal behavior. The findings from many shock probation studies revealed that they had little or no effect on the offenders’ behavior. For example, research findings from programs like “Scared Straight” revealed that they may have actually increased deviant behavior (Clear and Cole, 1986). States such as Ohio, Texas, Iowa, and Kentucky, along with New Zealand, initially experimented with shock probation programs. They provided the following findings on their programs.

An analysis of the Ohio program indicated some success with its first participants who experienced 130 percent less recidivism than those with prior records, except for offenders over 21 years of age. The analysis further indicated the potential for net-widening, or incarcerating offenders who would have otherwise been placed on regular probation (Vito, 1984). However, the recidivism rates for these programs never exceeded 26 percent (Vito, 1984). Notwithstanding, the Ohio study indicated that shock probation costs more than housing shock probationers in local jails (Thompson, 1975). Vito and Allen (1981) found those variables that positively affected Ohio’s shock probation outcomes were: Property offenses; education; having no prior record; and marital status. Traditional prisoners had a 42 percent lower probability of reoffending than shock probationers.

Research on Iowa’s program compared shock probationers with matched groups of regular probationers and halfway house residents and found little difference in recidivism. The investigators reported that the most significant predictor of recidivism was prior record, age, and marital status (Bourdouis and Turnbull, 1985). However, a later study

of the Iowa program revealed that of the 260 shock probationers released in fiscal year 1988, 136 were returned to prison, the majority for violating conditions of release.

In Texas, the Adult Probation Commission's Statistical Survey found after a three year period, 289 offenders from a sample of 1,078 probationers recidivated. This amounted to roughly 27 percent of those placed on shock probation. There were no follow-up studies conducted to determine how probationers fared after the third year of release (Kozuh, Guenther, Plattsmier and Buckmaster, 1980).

An offender-based tracking system reported that Kentucky's shock probationers had the highest rates of rearrest, reconviction and return to prison. Surprisingly, Kentucky's reincarceration rate was 21.4 percent. This was consistent with the findings from other shock probation programs that were heralded as effective (Vito and Ellis, 1985). Some argue that net-widening was pervasive in this Kentucky correctional practice (Vito, 1984). However, the most sobering study of programs similar to boot camp was conducted in New Zealand. The New Zealand Corrective Training Program incorporated hard work, discipline, and physical fitness in a 90-day program to "shock" young first-time offenders (male and female) between the ages of 15 and 20, followed by being placed on probation for one year. Program follow-up revealed that males and females had recidivism rates of 71 and 63 percent, respectively. Though these results are negative, they have significant implications. For example, they are not surprising considering the majority of these inmates were ethnic minorities. These figures could reveal the negative social conditions to which offenders returned after their release (Harland, 1987) and how these conditions may have been conducive for offenders to reengage in crime.

In summarizing shock probation, Allen, Carlson, and Parks (1979) found major criticisms such as: (1) They were discriminatory towards blacks; (2) there was evidence of net-widening; and (3) they all lacked the ability to isolate variables associated with program failure. Moreover, Petersilia (1987) found recidivism rates were higher among probationers who committed a single property offense with a prior adult or juvenile record. Other studies report that the best recidivism predictor is the extensiveness of the offenders' criminal history. These studies find that prior arrests reveal more about the probability of recidivism than other variables (Barlow, 1987). Like shock probation, other correctional practices and programs have yet to establish a definitive consensus on predictors of recidivism.

In 1979, the film "Scared Straight" dramatized the prison life of hard-core murderers and other lifers at Rahway Prison in New Jersey. The theory behind "scared straight" was that young offenders would be deterred from crime after a visit to a prison, followed by an intensive confrontation session with life-sentenced inmates who would make them think about the pains of imprisonment. Many states viewed this program as a panacea to the juvenile delinquent problem and quickly began adopting similar programs. Once the program was properly evaluated, it was determined that the Juvenile Awareness Project did not deter delinquency despite its claim of being a successful program. Rather, it was found that the experimental group committed 30 percent more new offenses (after 6 months follow-up) than the control group (Finckenauer, 1982). While many "scared straight" programs were created, only one Virginia program reported reducing delinquency; all others failed like Rahway. Each failed to prevent delinquency and actually made the situation worse (i.e., increased delinquency among the experimental or treatment group) (Lundman, 1993).

The correctional literature suggests the most successful treatment programs (unlike shock probation and scared straight) are those that incorporate diverse methods, rather than solely relying on a single approach to change offenders (Trojanowicz and Morash, 1987). This is especially true with respect to delinquent drug users who sometimes later become adult offenders. Since they face the greatest risk of recidivating and becoming career criminals, treatment approaches should be multidimensional. They should entail components that provide treatment and prevention (Chaiken and Johnson, 1988).

In 1968, the U.S. Army Correctional Training Facility (CTF) established stockade confinement in response to a growing number of offender populations and their high rates of discharge (during a period of the Vietnam War when manpower needs were significant in military units). The CTF, or the U.S. Army Retraining Brigade (USARB), provided:

. . . young, first offenders selected (military prisoners), the intensive counseling, correctional training, and close custodial supervision necessary to return them to duty as competent soldiers with improved behavior patterns and motivation. Those who did not or cannot meet Army Standards are eliminated from the service or transferred to an appropriate Army confinement facility (Research and Evaluation Division, 1973: 11).

CTF, or USARB, subjected offenders to physical and mental stressors. First, physical stress was produced by strenuous training requirements such as repelling, obstacle and confidence courses, road marches, and field training exercises. Second, mental pressure derived from continuing observations and evaluations of team work, peer pressure, and the Brigade's emphasis on high demanding standards of performance.

The environment fostered an evaluation of the individual's potential for further military service. Trainees were assigned counselors who monitored, advised, and assisted individuals with resolving problem situations. In this program, social workers, chaplains, and mental health professionals provided treatment approaches, such as reality therapy, behavioral contacts, and individual and group counseling. Additional help was given by lawyers, personnel, and finance specialists. Throughout this 8-week training program, drill sergeants and correctional specialists supervised individual progress. The results of the USARB program revealed that almost 70 percent of those who started the program completed it and over 80 percent earned an honorable discharge after completing their average remaining term of service. Another 10 percent received a general discharge and less than 10 percent received a dishonorable discharge (Research and Evaluation Division, 1978).

Despite its apparent success, several factors led to the demise of the USARB program. First, the end of the war and the draft reduced manpower needs and the volunteer Army began attracting qualified personnel (only high school graduates or above). Second, as a result of quality recruiting, crime and the need for confinement and rehabilitation decreased dramatically among soldiers. Even though the Army no longer has a boot camp program, the Army's Military Police (MP) School, located in Fort McClellan, Alabama, still trains civilian correctional officers in the Rehabilitation Training Instructors Course (RTIC). The course focuses on leadership, drill, discipline, motivation and physical fitness (Lima, 1993).

### **History of Contemporary Boot Camp Programs**

As the 1980s progressed, military basic training resurfaced as a viable correctional practice. Some scholars argue that since the crime rate and prison population were increasing, the social climate was ripe for this conservative and punitive approach for dealing with offenders. However, the question that emerged was how popular was the military training approach? At this time, little research had been done and even less data

had been collected on boot camp effectiveness. Notwithstanding, research by Dale Parent and Doris MacKenzie, supported by the National Institute of Justice, appears to have been the only research conducted. Still, there were no formal evaluations of boot camp. Beyond these efforts, the literature on correctional treatment encompasses mainly the forerunner of boot camps (i.e., shock probation) and preliminary boot camp studies.

Boot camps of the 1980s and 1990s generally provide a short term of incarceration (90 to 180 days) followed by probation supervision. These programs offer (using the military approach) correctional treatment and punishment, such as marching (drill and ceremonies); physical training; regimented discipline; and hard work for young, nonviolent, first-time incarcerated offenders. Such programs are referred to as shock incarceration, which alludes to its forerunner of the late 1960s and early 1970s, shock probation. However, they include multiple treatment components designed to reform the offender.

The growth of state correctional boot camp programs can be traced to Georgia and Oklahoma where they emerged in 1983 (Parent, 1989). By 1991, there were 24 programs established to reduce prison overcrowding. Seventy-one percent of them reported that deterrence and rehabilitation were the main purpose for starting boot camps. Fifty-eight percent reported establishing these programs to cut expensive correctional costs. Only one-half of the boot camps viewed punishment as its main purpose (MacKenzie, 1990).

### **Eligibility for Boot Camp Programs**

With few exceptions, states have established age limits for admission to boot camps, usually between 17 and 26 years. Two states, Alabama and New Mexico, have no age limits. Almost every state had an offense limitation; nonviolent or less than one first degree offense is the norm. The majority of boot camps are exclusively for males. There are some, though few in number, that are designed primarily for females.

### **Components of State Programs**

Without exception, every state with a boot camp incorporates military drill and ceremonies (marching) and physical training, since these are the components which make boot camps unique. Work is considered another vital component by all but one state. The vast majority of states

(almost 80 percent) believe that individual and group counseling are essential to the boot camp experience. Seventy-five percent of the programs recognize the need for drug and alcohol treatment. Fourteen states integrate educational programs into its boot camp. Less than 60 percent chose to include recreation, community services, and the General Equivalency Diploma (GED) preparation and testing as necessary components for boot camp. Less than 20 percent incorporate vocational training into their boot camp program. Several programs offer the twelve steps of Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) and Narcotics Anonymous (NA).

### **Profile and Costs of Boot Camp Inmates**

The profile of the typical inmate remains unchanged: He is 21 years of age, a white male, with a prior juvenile or adult record. Additionally, the typical boot camp inmate continues to be a drug user who was convicted for a "nonviolent" offense, generally property, and most likely burglary. The average cost of incarcerating the boot camp inmate for 90-120 days is \$4,205, which is considerably lower than the average cost for housing an inmate for a year in prison which usually costs \$21,000. Dollars can be saved through a quicker turnover of bed spaces in boot camp programs.

### **Criminological Theories Behind Boot Camps**

Classical criminology viewed each individual as responsible and having free will as a guiding principle, and that offenders exercise rational choice when committing criminal acts. This depends on whether the pleasure outweighs the pain. This recognition of the deterrent value of pain or punishment was another guiding principle of Beccaria's theory, along with the focus on the act (Vold and Bernard, 1986; Martin, Mutchnick, and Austin, 1990; Holman and Quinn, 1992 ). Most boot camp programs recognize that the individual offender is responsible for his behavior and that these behaviors result from the use of free will in making a choice.

Positivism contrasts with the classical understanding of behavior since it rejects free will and advocates individual determinism. Or as Holman and Quinn have stated:

That is, human behavior is believed governed by external environmental circumstances and/or internal biological conditions. Free will is,



therefore, an illusion. An example would be a starving person, living in abject poverty without hope of obtaining money or employment, who steals food. Although some would claim that this person still has the freedom to choose not to steal, a positivist would agree that she or he does not -- that such a person is forced into crime by circumstances (1992: 45-46).

Positivism focuses on the offender rather than the offense and views the offender as someone who needs treatment (Martin et al., 1990; Holman and Quinn, 1992). Hans Eysenck's theory of Operant Conditioning explains criminality as the result of combining the offender's biological makeup or personality and training. Vold and Bernard have summarized Operant Conditioning as using:

rewards and punishment to reinforce certain behaviors. For example, rats may be taught to press a lever by rewarding that behavior with a food pellet or by punishing with an electric shock its failure to push the lever. The rat learns to operate on its environment by associating rewards and punishment with its own behaviors. This operant conditioning is another way of learning by association (1986: 207).

Training for Eysenck involves receiving rewards for desired behavior and punishment for undesirable behavior, as well as the use of role models whose behavior can be emulated. His focus on punishment did not come at the expense of learning through training, which is the essence of operant conditioning (Eysenck, 1965). Boot camp programs use strict military discipline, barrack displays, marching, and physical training as parts of operant conditioning, rewarding desired military behavior and punishing unacceptable behavior with additional push-ups, extra duty, or other methods of military punishment. The boot camp environment is therapeutic with correctional officers and drill instructors acting as role models to be imitated in the military setting that is conducive to favorable change, personal growth, and adjustment (Trojanowicz and Morash, 1987). McCord and Sanchez (1983) found that those young inmates living under a controlled environment or "milieu therapy" recidivated less. Slavson (1965) believes that this approach is best used on offenders whose criminal behavior is a reaction to the conditions of their home, neighborhood, and quality of life.

Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) posit that offenders are opportunistic, impulsive, lack self-control, and pursue immediate gratification rather than postpone self-pleasure. Such criminals with low self-control

normally live for the moment. These offenders lack cognitive skills, are indifferent to their victims, and are more interested in their own pleasure. Boot camps capitalize on this theory and apply it in its program. They demand self-discipline and force participants to resist pleasures, such as cigarettes, candy, phone calls, and visitors. These pleasures are either postponed or completely denied throughout the boot camp experience to teach offenders self-discipline and self-control. Further, offenders are subjected to stressful situations so they must learn self-control and learn to deal with problems. Moreover, reality therapy is used so that offenders can learn to act in a responsible manner (Trojanowicz and Morash, 1987). Boot camps attempt to provide offenders with the self-control that they are lacking.

Activity therapy is used to help offenders manage aggression and hostility. Physical training is used to teach participants problem-solving techniques, aggression control, and to accept responsibility for the consequences of their actions (Serok and Blum, 1979). Yochelson and Samenow's theory attributes criminal behavior to irrational thinking, which causes the individual to make poor choices. If criminals can understand their thinking process and change their behavior accordingly, then they will make noncriminal choices (Samenow, 1984; Yochelson and Samenow, 1985). Samenow (1984) reports that recidivism is the most significant measure of change. Inmates must learn to control their anger, tempers, and whatever gets them into trouble (Samenow, 1984).

Boot camp administrators address offenders' poor thinking processes by including helpful components in their programs. One such component is a writing assignment where offenders list every crime they have committed, every person they have harmed, and how they injured those persons and themselves. The purpose of this assignment is to get inmates to realize that they are responsible for their actions and the consequences of poor decisions. Additionally, boot camp participants are asked to predict their future by writing a list of short-term and long-term goals that they have for themselves after release.

Throughout this historical review one theme continues to emerge. That theme is inmates can be rehabilitated by using an approach that incorporates scaring, shocking, and giving them a "taste" of prison, provided it is done within the context of an organized and controlled environment. Military training brings an organized and disciplined environment to the boot camp. This, along with a set of theories and processes, integrates an approach that punishes and rehabilitates offenders and invariably reduces recidivism.

Few correctional experts dispute that boot camps are punitive. However, opinions differ when discerning the overall purpose and goal of boot camp. Some contend that this is why boot camps are very difficult to evaluate, and why it is hard to generalize the success or failure of one boot camp to others. If boot camps are punishment-oriented, critics charge that their use must be justified or there would be no moral basis for subjecting an offender to this punishment. Bentham (1789) contends that punishment must have a stated goal and if it lacks this salient component, state authority is merely exercising an abuse of power.

### **Justifying the Use of Boot Camps to Punish Offenders**

Bean (1981) argued that justifying the use of punishment is a moral question because it subjects an offender to deprivation and suffering. Punishment is concerned with deterrence rather than reforming criminal behavior. The justification of punishment should include penalizing an offender while at the same time ensuring the safety of society. Punishment should have a deterrent effect that dissuades the accused (and others) from engaging in future behaviors that society finds offensive and criminal. In other words, punishment should have both a specific and general deterrent effect. Both forms of deterrence assume that offenders are rational and that the threat of punishment will prevent them from engaging in future crime.

### **General Deterrence**

General deterrence is not directed at the individual criminal, but instead, it focuses on potential offenders in a given community. One assumption of general deterrence is that "would be" criminals act rationally and weigh the gains and losses of engaging in criminal behavior. More specifically, Wilson (1975) posits that if offenders were certain that they would be apprehended and punished, they would abstain from criminal activity.

### **Specific Deterrence**

Specific deterrence focuses on the individual offender. Foucault (1978) states that prior to the twentieth century, extreme torture and physical punishment were used as specific deterrence to break the spirit of criminals. This was believed to cause criminals to desist from

engaging in further criminal behavior. While we no longer use such archaic methods, society employs lengthy prison sentences and alternatives as methods of specific deterrence to ensure that offenders will not repeat their behaviors. Criminal justice experts desire that punishment have both a general and specific deterrent effect.

While boot camps are heralded as treatment programs instead of punishment-oriented, deterrence can be accomplished. Christie (1993) contends that some programs are subtle attempts to distort the nature of punishment by applying euphemisms such as "sanctions," "treatments" or even "training" programs. Yet, they are clearly punitive. Critical scholars believe that boot camp programs follow in this tradition since they are called training programs.

### **Effects of Deterrence**

While deterrence is a constant goal of the criminal justice system, past research has cast doubt on the state's ability to achieve deterrence through punishment. For instance, Bursik, Grasmick, and Chamlin (1990) found that legal jurisdictions with high arrest rates continue to face the highest rates of crime. Similarly, Bedeau (1982) has failed to find a relationship between the use of the death penalty and reduced murder rate. Paternoster (1989) claims that perceptual deterrence studies fail to show that the law alone can serve as an effective deterrent to crime. In contrast, several authors argue that perceptual deterrence might be effective. Klepper and Dagin (1989) report that evidence suggests that individuals who fear capture and punishment are deterred from committing certain criminal acts. Grasmick and Bursik (1990) argued that informal sanctions presented by parents and peers have a more binding deterrent effect than laws and the threat of formal imprisonment.

### **Traditional Goals of Punishment**

Bentham (1789) argues that punishment given at whim is inherently inhumane and must only be disseminated for deterrence. Stated another way, Bentham thought that punishment must have deterrence as its underlying purpose. Today, the goals of punishment are consistent with Bentham's argument. They include incapacitation, retribution, rehabilitation, and restitution. As such, most states justify using boot camps as a punishment for one or more of the following reasons that

includes: Incapacitation, retribution, and rehabilitation. Restitution is not a reason why states use boot camps.

### **Incapacitation**

Incapacitation strategies remove offenders from the environment and provide confinement if the offender is perceived as a danger to community residents. It ensures that offenders will not hurt anyone again. This model is controversial to some criminal justice experts because it considers imprisoning offenders for what they might do in the future, not necessarily for the seriousness of what they have already done. As such, a boot camp sentence takes offenders off the streets and out of the community.

### **Retribution**

Durham (1994) argues that offenders should receive punishment because of the offense they have committed. Punishment is what they deserve for engaging in criminal behavior. Von Hirsch (1976) argues that this position holds that the punishment should be proportionate to the harm committed against society. Moreover, unlike incapacitation, offenders are punished for what they have done, not for what they might do in the future. It is believed that since the offender profited from his misdeed, he must repay society by restoring social balance (Bean, 1981). Therefore, a boot camp sentence is viewed as proportionate to the offense committed by the offender.

### **Rehabilitation**

Because many criminals have dysfunctional backgrounds and experiences, sympathizers argue that society has failed them. They argue that offenders should be rehabilitated because their immediate environments offered them limited life chances. Therefore, many criminal justice programs are designed to rehabilitate offenders. The rehabilitation model attempts to change the offender and readjust him to fit into society. This philosophy advocates treatment rather than punishment. The criminal justice system shows its commitment to rehabilitation by providing community-based programs and alternatives to traditional incarceration. Some of these programs include: Boot

camp, electronic monitoring, intensive probation supervision, and others.

This book argues that based on previous research findings, it is still unknown whether boot camps are accomplishing their stated goals. This is problematic because all boot camps in the United States, including those on the local and state levels, have different objectives and goals. They are not alike, and as such, the results from one boot camp cannot be generalized to all boot camp programs.

### Discussion Questions

1. Explain the forerunners to boot camps?
2. Provide a brief overview of the history of boot camps?
3. What theories best explain the use of boot camps as a correctional treatment option?
4. Explain the goals of punishment?
5. What was the purpose of Yates Law?

### Key Terms

Activity Therapy	low self-control
adult probation	military ceremonies
alcohol treatment	military structure
Alcoholics Anonymous (AA)	military training approach
Army Military Police School	Narcotics Anonymous (NA)
career criminals	offender populations
classical criminology	operant conditioning
criminal history	pains of imprisonment
delinquency	positivism
determinism	prevention
deterrence	probation
discipline	probation supervision
Elmira Reformatory	Rahway Prison
free will	rational choice
General Equivalency Diploma (GED)	Reality Therapy
inmate labor	rearrest
intensive basic training	reconviction
Juvenile Awareness Project	reform
juvenile delinquent	regular probationers

Rehabilitation Training	U. S. Army Correctional
Instructors Course (RTIC)	Training Facility (CTF)
reincarceration	U.S. Army Retraining
scared straight	Brigade (USARB)
shock probation	Yates Law
shock probationers	

## REFERENCES

- Allen, H., Carlson, E., and Parks, E. (1979). Critical issues in probation. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Barlow, H. (1987). Recidivism and prior criminal history: New findings from Illinois. *The Criminologist*, 12 (1): 1-12.
- Bean, P. (1981). Punishment: A philosophical and criminological inquiry. Martin Robertson, Oxford.
- Bedeau, H. (1982). The death penalty in America. 3<sup>rd</sup>. New York: Oxford Press.
- Bentham, B. (1789). On Crimes and Punishment. Trans. Henry Paolucci. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill (reprinted 1963).
- Bourdouis, J. and Turnbull, B. W. (1985). Shock probation in Iowa. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services, and Rehabilitation*, 9 (4): 53-67.
- Bursik, R., Grasmick, H., and Chamlin, M. (1990). The effect of longitudinal arrest patterns on the development of robbery trends at the neighborhood level. *Criminology*. 28:431-450.
- Chaiken, M. R. and Johnson, B. D. (1988). Characteristics of different types of drug-involved offenders. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, U. S. Department of Justice.
- Christie, N. (1993). Crime control as industry. London and New York: Routledge.

- Clear, T. R. and Cole, G. F. (1986). *American corrections*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Durham, A. (1994). *Crisis of reform: Current issues in American punishment*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1965). *Fact and fiction in psychology*. London: Penguin Books, Ltd
- Finckenauer, J. O. (1982). *Scared straight and the panacea phenomena*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *Discipline and punishment*. New York: Random House.
- Gottfredson, M. and Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Grasmick, H. and Bursik, R. (1990). Conscious, significant others and rational choice: Extending the deterrence model. *Law and Society Review*. 24: 837-861.
- Harland, A. (1987). *An evaluation of reconviction rates for female corrective trainees (Policy and Research Division)*. Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Justice.
- Holman, J. E. and Quinn, J. F. (1992). *Criminology: Applying theory*. New York: West Publishing Company.
- Klepper, S. and Dagin, D. (1989). Tax compliance and perceptions of the risks of detection and criminal prosecution. *Law and society review*. 23: 209-240.
- Kozuh, J., Guenther, R., Plattsmier, R., and Buckmaster, D. (1980). *1980 TAPC and Probation Survey*. Austin, TX: Texas Adult Probation Commission.
- Lima, J. M. (1993). Boot camps: Alternatives to incarceration training for correctional officers. *American Jails*, 7(1): 89-91.



- Lundman, R. J. (1993). *Prevention and control of juvenile delinquency*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- MacKenzie, D. L. (1990). Boot camp prisons: Components, evaluations and empirical issues. *Federal Probation*, 54(3): 44-52.
- Martin, R., Mutchnick, R. J., and Austin, U. T. (1990). *Criminological thought*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- McCord, W. and Sanchez, J. (1983). The treatment of deviant children: A twenty-five year follow-up study. *Crime and Delinquency*, 29(4): 238-253.
- Parent, D. G. (1989). *Shock incarceration: An overview of existing programs*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice.
- Paternoster, R. (1989). Decisions to participate in and desist from four types of common delinquency: Deterrence and rational choice perspective. *Law and Society Review*. 23:7-29.
- Petersilia, J. (1987). *Expanding options for criminal sentencing*. RAND (Report No. 3544-EMC). Santa Monica, CA.
- Research and Evaluation Division. (1973). *The U.S. Army Retraining Brigade Annual Report: Fiscal year 1973*. Fort Riley, KS: Department of the U. S. Army.
- Research and Evaluation Division. (1978). *The U.S. Army Retraining Brigade Annual Report: Fiscal year 1978*. Fort Riley, KS: Department of the U. S. Army.
- Samenow, S. E. (1984). *Inside the criminal mind*. New York: Times Books.
- Serok, S. and Blum, A. (1979). Games: A treatment vehicle for delinquent youths. *Crime and Delinquency*, 25(4): 358-363.
- Slavson, S. R. (1965). *Reclaiming the delinquent*. New York: The Free Press.

Smith, B. A. (1988). Military training at New York's Elmira reformatory 1888-1920. *Federal Probation*, 52(1): 33-40.

Thompson, R. D. (1975). Shock probation: A cost analysis of the economic impact on correctional institutions in Ohio. Unpublished master's thesis, Youngstown State University, Youngstown, Ohio.

Trojanowicz, R. C. and Morash, M. (1987). Juvenile delinquency: Concepts and control. (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Vito, G. F. (1984). Developments in shock probation: A review of research findings and policy implications. *Federal Probation*, 48(2): 22-27.

Vito, G. F. and Allen, H. E. (1981). Shock probation in Ohio: A comparison of outcomes. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 25(1): 70-76.

Vito, G. F. and Ellis, J. (1985). An offender-based tracking system study of three districts in the Commonwealth of Kentucky Research Report Series: No. 4). Louisville, KY: University of Louisville, College of Urban and Public Affairs, Urban Studies Center.

Vold, G. B. and Bernard, T. J. (1986). *Theoretical criminology* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Von Hirsch, A. (1976). *Doing Justice*. New York: Hill and Wang.

Wilson, J. Q. (1975). *Thinking about crime*. New York: Basic Books.

Yochelson, S. and Samenow, C. E. (1985). *The criminal personality, Volume III: The drug user*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, Inc.



## CHAPTER 3

---

### **Drug Use History and Shock Incarceration Outcome**

Corrections has witnessed a rapid expansion in the use of boot camps as a form of short-term shock incarceration (Yurkanin, 1988). Generally, boot camp programs are offered as an inexpensive alternative to prison, which could reduce prison overcrowding. Many programs are based on the theory that physical exertion and the military-style discipline will both improve the physical condition of offenders and instill order and discipline in their lives. Most shock incarceration programs also offer additional components, such as counseling and adult education, which are further regarded as improving offenders' chances to succeed following release (Parent, 1989).

Whether this form of punishment is an effective alternative to traditional forms of incarceration remains speculation. We simply do not know whether boot camps will save money or reduce prison overcrowding. Some experts are optimistic, but there is no conclusive evidence to support its merits (Parent, 1988; Welborn, 1989; MacKenzie and Shaw, 1990). In fact, if the history of corrections is any indication, the boot camp could prove to be just one more program in the criminal justice arsenal which merely expands the nets of incarceration.

Some studies (MacKenzie and Shaw, 1990), for example, have examined boot camps with an attempt to distinguish between characteristics of those who complete the program versus those who do not. The ability to predict completion is important in achieving the goal of reducing prison overcrowding. If a participant does not complete the program, the offender goes to prison and the prison population is not reduced. Plus, the states must then pay for the offender to be given

traditional incarceration. Thus, being able to predict those who are likely to succeed will invariably save time and scarce economic resources. However, there have been few studies which examine the possibility that the program is more effective for certain types of offenders than others. The admission requirements for most programs implicitly assume this is the case by restricting the programs to non-violent offenders, but little research has been done to determine which offenders are more likely to benefit from a boot camp regime. The corrections literature overwhelmingly reveals that traditional incarceration has seldom been successful in deterring crime or rehabilitating offenders.

Boot camp programs tend to be targeted towards particular offender groups. Virtually all target non-violent and first-time offenders believed by sentencing judges to be salvageable. Moreover, many states use boot camps as a program for offenders who suffer from problems of substance abuse (Mathias and Mathews, 1991). Ironically, one factor consistently found to be related to recidivism among incarcerated offenders is drug use. Those with a history of drug use are more likely to recidivate than others. Because of this, it seems likely that drug use would be related to boot camp failures. Since a large percentage of boot camp participants are drug offenders, the question arises: "Are boot camps an effective means of rehabilitating those with drug and alcohol problems?"

### **The Alabama Boot Camp Program**

Located at the Kilby Correctional Facility, the Alabama Disciplinary Rehabilitation Unit (DRU) began September, 1988. As of July 1990, there were 581 graduates and 112 failures (boot camp washouts transferred to the general prison population). Section 15-18-8 of the Alabama Criminal Code allows the state to establish disciplinary, rehabilitation, or conservation camp programs in which convicted male offenders may be confined. Although a boot camp sentence may result from a plea bargain, assignment is usually made by the sentencing judge. Offenders are usually sentenced to boot camp when the presiding judge can see some potential for rehabilitation. The boot camp serves as reality therapy for young offenders, but is reserved for male convicts who would have otherwise received a prison sentence. It is not an alternative to probation.

The Alabama Boot Camp Program is specifically designed around a Twelve-Step model. Because it is specifically intended to serve as a form of treatment for drug and alcohol abusers, results from the program have

been chosen to address the issue of effectiveness for participants with a history of drug and alcohol problems.

It is proposed that there are significant differences between boot camp participants who complete and those who fail shock incarceration programs. Therefore, the purpose of the chapter is to determine if a self-reported history of drug use, supported by official data, is related to completion or failure in shock incarceration.

## METHODOLOGY

### Subjects

The study was conducted with the first class of the Alabama Boot Camp Program. The data for this study was collected in July 1989. At the time, approximately 220 individuals had been through the program. Of these participants, 50 failed the program (23%) and 170 graduated from the program. Because of this high failure rate, this study was undertaken to determine if there were significant differences in drug use between the participants who completed the program and those who failed. To accomplish this, two samples were drawn: One from the graduates and the other from the failures.

The samples for this analysis were chosen systematically. At the time of this study, the Alabama Boot Camp had processed only 220 inmates. Because of this small number, the study was conducted using the first 50 completions and the first 50 failures. The first sample consisted of the first 50 participants that completed the program, which also represented almost one-third of the graduates and 23 percent of the total participants. The failure group consisted of the entire population of boot camp participants that did not complete the program. This sample also represented 23 percent of the boot camp participants.

Rather than randomly selecting the sample of graduates, it was determined that selecting the first 50 graduates would be more valuable in this study. Both groups attended the program during the same period and would have been subjected to similar conditions. Since randomization was not utilized to select the sample, this study might be construed as being an invalid representation of the inmate population at the Alabama Boot Camp Program. However, because of its size (representing almost one-third of the graduates at the time of selection), the sample does appear to be representative of the entire group of boot camp participants.

## Measures

The instrument used to collect the data from the correctional files was devised after receiving a sample file containing the available data from institutional records. More specifically, data had to be collected from four major sources: (1) The boot camp commander's office; (2) the Alabama Department of Correction's Central Records Office; (3) the Research Monitoring and Evaluation Office; and (4) the Alabama Board of Pardons and Parole.

The boot camp office (at Kilby) contained a list of all graduates and nongraduates by date of entrance and departure; identification number; reasons for nongraduate failure; offense of conviction; and subsequent reason for boot camp selection. The major center for all inmate records is the Central Records section of the Department of Corrections Files (active and inactive) which maintain data on all youths and adults in the Alabama Department of Corrections.

Drug use data were acquired from the inmates' prison files. Most of these data were found in pre-sentence reports and other investigative records. Drugs most commonly abused by participants included alcohol, marijuana, cocaine, and phenylcyclohexyl piperidine (PCP). Many offenders reported using a combination of these drugs.

Participants were given questionnaires that focused on drug involvement when they entered and exited the program. They were also required to write a history of their drug use. Because many offenders were given the boot camp sentence for drug violations, their official records helped corroborate self-reported drug use and involvement in some cases (Anderson, 1990). To further safeguard against false reporting, as argued by Inciardi (1987), participants' initial questionnaires were compared to their exit questionnaires. Those that were found to be inconsistent, were excluded from the study. One possible shortcoming is that the time period of drug use is not clearly defined. The time span for drug use varied by subject in both the official records and self-reports.

Program completion in boot camp is measured by graduation and subsequent release onto probation by the court. Program failure in boot camp means the individual did not graduate owing failure to the inability to follow boot camp rules; bad attitude; fighting; insubordination; medical; or some other reason similar to these. As a result, the court returned the offender to the general prison population to serve the full

sentence. Drug use was compressed into the categories of none, single, or multiple drug use.

## RESULTS

The hypothesis tested was not supported by the data. Drug use and boot camp completion or failure are not correlated, indicating no significant relationship between these two variables. The Pearson  $r$  was  $-.029$  and the chi-square test was not significant at the  $.05$  level (see Table 3.1). The results show that the level of drug use did not influence the rate of completion or failure of boot camp participants. (Pearson's correlation coefficient gives a precise measure of the strength and direction of the correlation in the sample being studied, while chi-square is a nonparametric test of significance whereby expected frequencies are compared against observed frequencies).

Table 3.1 Reported Outcome of Drug Use History

Variable	Chi Square	Significance	Pearson $r$
Drug Use	4.40	.110	.029

## DISCUSSION

Although this finding failed to show statistical significance, the finding is still important because the Alabama Boot Camp Program is heavily grounded in the notions of the Twelve-Steps (life skills), which target the participants' drug problems. It might be that the Twelve Step Program approach, adopted from Alcoholic Anonymous (AA), requires further study as to its utility or effectiveness for the boot camp. More importantly, the administrators of the Alabama Boot Camp Program feel that people who have drug problems are the best candidates for boot camp. It may be that a more viable drug program is needed for these candidates.

This study was not able to confirm or refute the effectiveness of boot camps to reduce prison overcrowding. Certainly, the potential is there once it has been determined that such programs are effective in reducing recidivism. To make such programs more effective will require looking at the ways in which failures can be reduced, since boot camp completion



means an inmate will not be sentenced to prison any longer than 4 months compared to the normal sentence of 24 to 36 months. The length of prison stay causes a stacking effect, which can only increase overcrowding.

A 1989 nationwide survey of boot camp programs and a 1991 follow-up reported that 75 percent of the existing boot camp programs recognized the imperative need of having a drug and alcohol component. They reported having a twelve-step approach or some other form of drug treatment mechanism. Some states have their own "life skills" approach, which essentially serves as an alcohol and drug component.

It was hoped that as a result of this study, the Alabama judiciary and prison system would be able to know, with some confidence, who would be the best candidates for boot camp. However, as a result of studying this variable, one cannot conclude which participants could complete the program. Since there are not enough significant differences to predict completion or failure, this study cannot aid the judiciary or prison officials in their boot camp selection process.

### Discussion Questions

1. Are boot camps uniquely designed to treat drug users? Why?
2. What are the best measures of success for boot camps?
3. Explain the use of the Twelve-Step Program in boot camps?
4. What were the results of the Alabama boot camp program concerning drug use and boot camp completion?
5. Should states make a conscious effort to target drug offenders for boot camp? Explain.

### Key Terms

Alabama Disciplinary  
Rehabilitation Unit (DRU)  
Alabama Criminal Code  
criminal justice arsenal  
drug use data  
first-time offenders  
history of drug use  
nets of incarceration  
nonviolent offenders

offender groups  
plea bargain  
pre-sentence reports  
program completion  
program failure  
self-reported history  
substance abuse  
twelve-step model  
wash-outs

## REFERENCES

Alabama Criminal Code, Section 15-18-8.

Anderson, J. F. (1990). An exploratory study to determine success and failure in the Alabama boot camp program. Unpublished masters' thesis. Alabama State University.

Inciardi, J. A. (1987). Criminal justice. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

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

Mathias, R. and Mathews J. (1991). The boot camp program for offenders: Does the shoe fit? *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 35, 322-327.

Parent, D. (1988). Shock incarceration programs. American Probation and Parole Association. National Institute of Justice, 14 Perspectives. Fall.

Parent, D. (1989). Shock incarceration: An overview of existing programs. National Institute of Justice, Issues and Practices. June.

Welborn, J. (1989). A senator speaks: Boot camps work in Michigan. *Corrections Today*. July.

Yurkanin, A. (1988). Trend toward shock incarceration increasing among states. *Corrections Today*. June.



## **CHAPTER 4**

---

### **What Disciplinary Rehabilitation Unit Participants Are Saying About Shock Incarceration: The Alabama Experience**

Because of increasing crime problems, low correctional budgets, and a growing inmate population, Alabama, like many other states, is searching for alternatives to incarceration to accommodate large numbers of offenders (Hunter, Burton, Marquart, and Cuvelier, 1992; Anderson and Dyson, 1996). One viable alternative to traditional imprisonment is shock incarceration, or boot camp programs (Parent, 1989). MacKenzie (1990) and Parent (1989) contend that boot camps became popular in the latter 1980s. However, their appeal has survived the 1980s, and today, are very much a part of correctional practices. For example, in a 1991 nationwide survey of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the Federal Bureau of Prisons, 46 percent of the 52 respondents had either established or were considering creating boot camp programs (Burns and Vito, 1995).

Freeland (1987) maintains that boot camp correctional programs are designed to provide nonviolent offenders, ages 17 through 26, with a "taste" of prison without housing them in the same facilities with older, more hardened criminals. They are patterned after military boot camps, providing youth offenders with stringent discipline and rigorous physical labor. The goal behind the drilling, exercise and intimidation by the drill instructor is to strip away excuses and rationales most inmates have for their illegal actions and impulsive behavior (Ratiff, 1988). Yurkanin (1988) maintains that shock incarceration provides young, nonviolent felons the opportunity to reduce, or eliminate, a prison sentence in exchange for a stipulated length of time in a structured boot camp

environment. Upon completion of boot camp, the participant is placed on probation and post-release supervision. Each jurisdiction can mandate additional conditions, such as requiring an inmate to have a job or perform community service.

The proliferation of boot camps is rather surprising since many formal evaluations have not been conducted to determine their overall effectiveness (Hayeslip, 1994). Despite this, boot camps continue to grow in number. Furthermore, since the passage of President Clinton's Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, which allocated \$2 billion to create more boot camps, they could be a part of correctional practices for years to come. Though boot camp research is replete with studies measuring attitudinal changes and recidivism levels (Anderson and Dyson, 1996; MacKenzie and Shaw, 1990; Hunter et al, 1992), one neglected area of shock incarceration is what the offenders themselves think about the boot camp experience. Therefore, this chapter explores participants' perspectives of benefits related to shock incarceration. This study attempts to address this neglected area by examining the Alabama boot camp as told by its participants. The Alabama boot camp was selected for this investigation because its program is theoretically different from other boot camp programs.

### **The Alabama Boot Camp Program: An Overview**

The Alabama boot camp program, often referred to as the Disciplinary Rehabilitation Unit (DRU), began in September 1988 at the Kilby Correctional Facility and later relocated at the Childersburg Prison. The boot camp program has the capacity to accommodate more than 180 offenders at any given time. The program normally lasts 90 days unless an offender is recycled for failing to make satisfactory progress in a particular phase. However, the Alabama boot camp program differs from others because this program is grounded in two theoretical treatment approaches. Other programs lack this essential approach to treating offenders.

### **Theories Behind DRU**

The theories behind the Alabama program stem from rational choice and Yochelson and Samenow's work on the criminal personality (see Yochelson and Samenow, 1977; Beccaria, 1764; Bentham, 1789; Akers, 1994). The Rational Choice Theory contends that offenders violate the

law after rationally exercising free will, rather than being influenced by reasons beyond their control (social or environmental factors). Moreover, offenders calculate the risks and potential gains of committing crimes based on their experiences, knowledge of the law, and punishment. As a result, if they perceive that the gains from committing crime outweigh the possibility of being apprehended, offenders will engage in criminal behavior. Further, choice theorists contend that if offenders are fearful of being punished, they will probably forego violating the law. Yochelson and Samenow argue that though offenders exercise free will and rational decision-making when they engage in crime, they invariably fail to see themselves as criminals. Instead, they see themselves as they wish. However, if they are to change, they must come to see themselves as they truly are.

DRU's theoretical base integrates these philosophies and emphasizes that the offenders are ultimately responsible for their actions, and that they exercised free will and rational decision-making when they violated the law. As a result, the Alabama program is committed to getting offenders to accept they are responsible for their own actions because when they engaged in crime, they exercised their choice. On the matter of choice, Yochelson and Samenow (1977:12) contend:

We take the position that man has the capacity to choose. The criminal made choices early in life and continues to do so in the present. Now, he is in a position in which he has three options: more crime with all its risks (which may seem less appealing from behind bars), suicide, or total change as we define and practice it. We do not try to persuade him to change. It is his choice; it is his life.

### **Inmates and Staff**

In Alabama, there is no specified age limit for those eligible for the boot camp sentence. However, offenders are usually between the ages of 15 and 34. Many of those sentenced have juvenile records while some have prior juvenile probationary sentences. Most are property offenders and are nonviolent. All offenders must pass a physical examination, which ensures sufficient physical ability. The Alabama program is exclusively for males. Correctional officers responsible for monitoring and training DRU participants are selected by a board after undergoing intense interviews. These officers must pass a physical examination and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) examination

to ensure that they are not harmful to themselves or the offenders. Correctional guards, like offenders, are closely monitored by the program's psychologist to determine if their behavior conforms with the standards of the program.

### **Components of DRU**

The main components of DRU are marching; discipline; physical training; hard work; drug and alcohol treatment; individual and group counseling; plus the "Twelve-Steps" program used by Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) and Narcotics Anonymous (NA). Each component is designed to help rehabilitate the offenders. The main purpose of the Alabama program is not just to punish offenders, cut prison costs, or reduce overcrowding, rather, its primary concern is to rehabilitate offenders and reduce the state's recidivism level. As a result, the Alabama boot camp is divided into three phases that are designed to address specific offender needs.

### **Phase One**

Phase One consumes the first thirty days of the participants' time. It is designed to explore the depth of the inmates' thought process. In keeping with its theoretical base, this phase attempts to make offenders recognize that they made the choice to commit a crime and that they must learn to control their actions. As part of their treatment, offenders in this phase are urged to write down their criminal history. This is designed to get the offenders to confront their criminal behavior by examining the consequences of poor choices. The staff psychologist has noted that on the first day of this exercise resistance and denial are pervasive. One participant explains his experience of the first phase of the Alabama shock incarceration program:

I learned that I have a problem with people who are in charge.... For the first time in my life I learned to be honest with myself.... It made me see that I have no one to blame but me for the poor choice I have made.... I finally had to own up to all the bad things I have done and admit sorrow for them.... I wasn't honest with myself.... I learned that I did not have self-control of myself.... I became aware of my negative attitude.

DRU officials demand conformity and discipline to ensure that the participants' experience is successful in restructuring their thought patterns and changing their lives. Boot camp participants usually spend two days writing the crimes they have committed, the injuries they have inflicted on victims, and eventually the consequences of their behavior. Slowly, the excuses they use to justify their behavior disappear and they concede that they made their own choices to commit crime, even if they were influenced by alcohol and/or drugs. During this phase, they accept that they chose to get high or become intoxicated, and that they have no other excuse. These offenders are taught that many other citizens in society face adversities each day and do not commit crime. Thus, social conditions, such as poverty, race, or substance abuse, do not justify harming others. Every excuse is negated, while individual responsibility is stressed.

## **Phase Two**

Phase Two exposes the offenders to problem-solving techniques. In this phase, the Twelve-Steps of AA/NA are emphasized and participants are taught that they must take one day at a time and apply problem-solving techniques in daily situations. The Twelve-Steps are seen as an excellent self-help counseling program and are used extensively in this phase. Participants are taught how to use each step to help restructure their lives. They are told how to apply them to drug addiction and criminal behavior. Moreover, they are taught how to control and diffuse anger. In Phase Two, offenders are made more aware of themselves. For example, they learn more about their strengths and weaknesses. They are made to confront the individuals about which they know the least -- themselves. Officials at DRU view this phase as a period of "Self-Discovery," because many participants begin to realize that their decision to choose, coupled with newly learned problem-solving techniques, could prevent them from reoffending after release. Of Phase Two, a participant explains:

The physical training (PT) has given me a certain confidence that I can do anything... The PT program and the discipline given me by my drill instructor has shown me that I can do for myself instead of relying on other people... The 12 steps and the classes have helped me to think better and will help me to stay away from drugs... The counseling has taught me how to control myself and how to listen when other people



talk... I like the marching because it makes me feel proud... The group counseling has changed me by teaching me to control anger and follow orders... The sessions with the DI's showed me that I can learn how not to be misled.

During the discovery phase, participants begin to understand that if they desire, they can live a life free of crime. At this time, the theoretical philosophies held by DRU begin to influence offenders' thinking processes, because they begin to see themselves as individuals who have made mistakes and poor decisions by freely engaging in criminal behavior. They now realize that by receiving a sentence to DRU, they were given a second chance to be law-abiding. They are aware that when they engaged in crime they were making a rational decision not to be law-abiding. DRU officials report that during this phase, they can see substantial changes in the attitudes and behavior of the participants. As a result, officials encourage participants to live a law-abiding life after release by applying the techniques learned in Phase Two of the program.

### **Phase Three**

This phase targets pre-release training and personal development. Offenders are required to write a plan outlining how they intend to spend the rest of their lives following release. During this phase, offenders are subjected to many lectures, given by social workers, designed to assist them in making the transition from incarceration to the free community. These aides assist them in designing a realistic plan to follow after they are released. To adequately inform offenders about the prospect of their future, officials at DRU do not deceive them into thinking that they will have more opportunities than they had before incarceration. Instead, administrators inform them that the odds are perhaps against them. Therefore, they should apply everything they are taught in the boot camp program to engage in honest living. Still, throughout each phase of the program, offenders experience the daily routine of marching, hard work, physical training, and counseling. Each offender is constantly being taught to accept responsibility for his own actions.

## **METHODOLOGY**

Data in this investigation were collected over a six month period. Many physical observations were made at the boot camp facility. Though

a number of formal and informal interviews were given to boot camp staff and the offender population while they performed their daily tasks, this study focuses on the survey responses of the boot camp participants. Offenders were given a six item survey (see Table 4.2 for the Boot Camp Inmate Questionnaire) after completing DRU to determine if they had undergone substantial changes that might alter their criminal lifestyles and to discover what they could tell boot camp officials about the program. Participants were asked six questions in the form of open-ended responses. Open-ended responses are believed to be higher on validity than closed-ended questions. For example, unlike close-ended questions, open-ended questions allow researchers to acquire answers that are unexpected and may describe more closely the real views of respondents (see Babbie, 1995; Nachmias and Nachmias, 1996; Hagan, 1989; Flowers, 1988). After the responses in this investigation were obtained, they were coded into categories. Moreover, official data were collected at the Alabama Department of Corrections Central Records (ADCR) to corroborate the accuracy of information given by subjects who were interviewed during this investigation.

This descriptive study was conducted with the first group of the Alabama boot camp program. At that time, 153 participants graduated and 50 failed the program. Since 153 offenders successfully completed the program, a sample of 77 offenders was randomly selected from that population. Because these participants had been sentenced to the program at the same time and had experienced similar conditions, this sample would allow for generalization. Furthermore, because the sample was randomly selected from a population of offenders with similar background characteristics, such as offense; race; gender; education; and occupation, it was thought that the sample truly represented participants at the Alabama boot camp program. Therefore, generalizations could be inferred from the sample.

## Subjects

The current investigation contains responses that were provided by 77 participants in an outgoing questionnaire. The demographic characteristics of DRU participants in this investigation are that the majority of the participants are white; disproportionately aged 20 years and under, averaged 9.8 years of formal education; were either unskilled workers or laborers; and overwhelmingly nonviolent offenders (see Table

4.1).

Table 4.1 Demographic Characteristics of DRU Participants

Variables	*Number
Race	
White	42
Black	35
Mean Age	20
Education Level (Mean)	9.5 Years
Occupation (Type)	Unskilled/Laborer
Offenses	
Theft of Property	20
Burglary	19
Receiving Stolen Property	6
Drugs	14
Robbery	5
Forgery	4
Others	9

\*Results given in raw numbers

## Measures

Boot camps operate under the guise that many of its participants lack respect for law and authority and have low self-control, which causes them to commit crime. Consequently, the survey instrument used to collect data from offenders focused on what the offenders felt they were getting from the boot camp program. As a result, the overall objective of the investigation was to determine if participants had experienced changes after completing the program that would make them conform their behavior to standards of the law. Alabama prison officials thought that the participants' responses would indicate if they were committed to not reoffending after release. Thus, the items in the survey attempted to measure areas such as: Things learned about self after DRU; overall offender change; components of boot camp believed to be the most helpful; how offenders viewed the program before and after; and what

offenders liked most about the boot camp experience. These measures were selected because they are recurring patterns throughout the boot camp literature that are primarily aimed at assessing effectiveness, success, and offenders commitment to be law-abiding (see Hunter, et al, 1992; MacKenzie and Shaw, 1993; Burton, Marquart, Cuvelier, Hunter, and Fiftal, 1992; Lambert, 1990; Grande and Prejean, 1991).

## Results

From the six-item survey given to the seventy-seven exiting participants, fifty indicated that the experience taught them self-control. Forty-seven reported that they are now self-disciplined, and twenty-four revealed that they gained self-respect. Seventeen reported that they are better able to deal with problems, while eleven stated that they can now stay away from drugs. From the sample of 77, seventy-six reported that they have changed since the boot camp experience, while one offender stated that he has not experienced any changes. Thirty-eight of the offenders reported that they now have a positive outlook on life. Twenty-eight of the offenders stated that they have learned more respect and self-control. Ten offenders reported that they have now learned to think and listen, while one offender admitted that he has not changed.

When reporting on what they feel they can take from the boot camp experience that will help them the most, fifty reported that the self-discipline and self-control will help them remain law-abiding. Thirteen stated that the good attitudes they have developed will help them the most on the outside. Ten offenders reported that learning to respect others will help them on the outside, while four offenders believe that their ability to stay away from drugs will assist them the most.

The respondents reported how they initially viewed the boot camp program. Of the seventy-seven offenders, fifty-three reported that they expected the program to be hard and tough. Nineteen offenders thought the program would be stupid, while five offenders thought it would be good. However, after experiencing the program, seventy-five offenders reported the program was a positive experience, while two participants thought it was a negative experience.

When asked what was the one thing that they liked most about the boot camp program, forty-four participants reported that they liked the physical training and marching. Fifteen offenders stated that they liked the classes offered, ten indicated that they liked working, and eight liked

other tasks (see Table 4.3 Summary Table of Results for Boot Camp Inmate Questionnaire).

To determine the levels of recidivism in Alabama, we compared three groups. These included DRU participants, parolees, and probationers. Recidivism occurs when an offender is released from either boot camp, prison, or probation, and subsequently reoffends and is returned to the Alabama Department of Corrections (ADC) for committing a new crime or violating a condition of release. Data collected by the ADC indicate that boot camp participants compare favorably with a recidivism rate of 14.4%, while the other groups had rates of 10.2% and 17.4%, respectively after one year.

## DISCUSSION

The recidivism rate for the Alabama boot camp program is 14.4%. This comes as good news to correctional officials who are concerned about repeat offenders and scarce bed space that could be used for more serious offenders. While DRU is successful in reducing the number of offenders from recidivating, other boot camps have not had the same success. Though each boot camp is different in its own right, it could be that DRU's uniqueness lies within its theoretical approaches which target getting offenders to see themselves as they really are (people who have willingly made mistakes) and having them accept responsibility for their actions. This "no nonsense" approach to treating offenders is perhaps better than subjecting them to harsh punishment while at shock incarceration.

After DRU, the majority of the offenders reported that they learned self-control and discipline, which could account for DRU's low recidivism level. Perhaps probationers are now better able to control their impulsiveness and aggressive behavior when they are angered. Moreover, seventy-six reported that they had been positively changed by the boot camp experience. This finding is consistent with the number of offenders that have not reentered the system. The majority of the offenders reported that they felt they have a positive outlook on life since their sentence to DRU. Perhaps, officials at this boot camp are making positive efforts at reforming offenders. Therefore, the authors contend that before boot camp officials graduate participants, they should listen to what offenders are saying about their program. As the Alabama experience shows, this could help states save limited bed space, scarce resources, and ultimately rehabilitate offenders.

### Discussion Questions

1. What one area in the research is neglected when studying the use and effectiveness of boot camps?
2. What results did Freeelander and Yurkanin find in their studies of boot camp?
3. What are the three phases of the Alabama DRU? Explain the contents of each.
4. From the perspective of participants in the Alabama boot camp, what were the major areas of learning acquired concerning their behavior?
5. Which phase of DRU is the most important and why?

### Key Terms

Alabama Department of  
Central Records (ADCR)  
Alabama Department of  
Corrections (ADC)  
alternatives to incarceration  
Boot Camp Inmate  
Questionnaire  
closed-ended questions  
community service  
condition of release  
correctional practices  
corrections guards  
criminal history  
criminal personality  
Disciplinary Rehabilitation  
Unit (DRU)  
drill instructor  
formal evaluations  
hardened criminals  
Kilby Correctional Facility

Minnesota Multiphasi  
Personality Inventory  
open-ended responses  
personal development  
Phase One  
Phase Three  
Phase Two  
post-release supervision  
pre-release training  
problem-solving techniques  
rational choice  
Rational Choice Theory  
rigorous physical labor  
self-discipline  
self-discovery  
Self-Help Counseling Program  
shock incarceration  
theoretical treatment  
approaches  
Violent Crime Control and  
Law Enforcement Act of  
1994

### REFERENCES

- Akers, R. L. (1994). *Criminological theories: Introduction and evaluation*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Anderson, J. F. and Dyson, L. (1996). A tracking investigation to determine boot camp success and offender risk assessment for CRIPP participants. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 19(1): 179-190.
- Babbie, E. (1995). *The practice of social research*. (7th ed.). Belmont, CA.: Wadsworth Press.
- Beccaria, B. (1764). *On crime and punishments*. Trans. Henry Paolucci. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill (reprinted 1963).
- Bentham, J. (1789). *An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation*. New York: Kegan pail (reprinted in 1948).
- Burns, J. and Vito, G. (1995). An impact analysis of the Alabama boot camp program. *Federal Probation*, (March) 63-67.
- Burton, Jr., V. S., Marquart, J. W., Cuvelier, S., Hunter, R., and Fiftal, L. (1992). *The Harris County Courts Regimented Intensive Probation Program (CRIPP). An outline for a program evaluation assessing correctional effectiveness*. Texas Probation, (forthcoming).
- Flowers, F. J. (1988). *Survey research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Freeland, D. (1987). Money for boot camp at issue: Prison, state officials at odds over funds availability. *The Houston Post*, December 28, 1987.
- Grande, P. and Prejean, R. (1991). An analysis of boot camps in Texas. *Texas Probation Journal*, (Fall), 109-114.
- Hagan, F. E. (1989). *Research methods in criminal justice and criminology*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Hayeslip, D. W. (1994). Correctional boot camps: Promise and pitfall. Unpublished paper presented at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Chicago, IL. (March).

Hunter, R. J., Burton, V. S., Marquart, J. W., and Cuvelier, S. J. (1992). Measuring attitudinal change of boot camp participants. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 8 (4): 283-297.

Lambert, C. (1990). Boot camps: Latest trend in juvenile justice. *Youth Law News*, 5, (September/October), 6.

MacKenzie, D. L. (1990). Boot camp programs grow in number and scope. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Justice.

MacKenzie, D. L. and Shaw, J. (1990). Inmates adjustment and change during shock incarceration: The impact of correctional boot camp programs. *Justice Quarterly*, (March), 125-50.

MacKenzie, D. L. and Shaw, J. (1993). The impact of shock incarceration on technical violations and new criminal activities. *Justice Quarterly*, Vol. 10, 3, (September).

Nachmias, C. F. and Nachmias, D. (1996). Research methods in the social sciences. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Parent, D. G. (1989). Shock incarceration: An overview of existing programs. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice.

Public Law 103-322 (1994). Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, (September).

Ratiff, B. (1988). The army model: Boot camp for youthful offenders. *Corrections Today*, December.

Yochelson, S. and Samenow, C. E. (1977). The criminal personality: The drug user. Volume III, Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, Inc.

Yurkanin, A. (1988). Trend toward shock incarceration increasing among states. *Corrections Today*.



Table 4.2 Boot Camp Inmate Questionnaire

1. What two things have you learned about yourself from your boot camp experience?
2. Do you feel like you have changed since you started boot camp? If yes, how have you changed?
3. What is the one thing from the boot camp that you feel will help you on the outside more than anything else?
4. How did you view this program when you first started?
5. Now, how do you view this program?
6. What is the one thing you liked the most about the program?
*Questions were asked in open-ended form and data were coded in categories.

Table 4.3 Summary Table of Result Boot Camp Inmate Questionnaire

1. What two things have you learned about yourself from your boot camp experience?	
Self-control	50
Discipline	47
Self-respect	24
Deal with problems	17
Can Stay away from drugs	11
Others	5

<p>2. Do you feel like you have changed since you started boot camp?</p> <p>Yes 76</p> <p>No 1</p> <p>If yes, how have you changed?</p> <p>Positive outlook and attitude 38</p> <p>Learned to respect and control my self 28</p> <p>Learned to think and listen 10</p> <p>Unknown 1</p>	
<p>3. What is the one thing from the boot camp that you feel will help you on the outside more than anything else?</p> <p>Self-discipline and control 50</p> <p>Good attitude 13</p> <p>Respect for others 10</p> <p>Stay away from drugs 4</p>	
<p>4. How did you view this program when you first started?</p> <p>Hard and tough 53</p> <p>Crazy and stupid 19</p> <p>Would be good 5</p>	
<p>5. Now, how do you view this program?</p> <p>Positively good 75</p> <p>Negatively bad 2</p>	

6. What is the one thing you liked the most about the program?	
Physical training and marching	44
Classes	15
Work	10
Others	8
*Questions were asked in open-ended form and data were coded in categories.	

## **CHAPTER 5**

---

### **Do Attitudinal Changes Among Boot Camp Participants Predict Recidivism?**

Because of increasing crime problems and high victimization levels, many states are managing large criminal populations. These growing populations continue to place added strain on jails and prisons across the country since many are under court order to alleviate the number of inmates in these facilities (Anderson and Dyson, 1996). As a result, state correctional agencies are seeking diversions as an alternative for several reasons: (1) To reduce the number of inmates entering the system; (2) to save strained correctional budgets; and (3) to reserve scarce bed space for serious law violators. Diversions include intermediate programs, such as house arrest; electronic monitoring; intensive probation supervision; boot camps; and other community-based correctional programs. These alternatives have become popular in recent years because of their economic potential to be cost-effective and their commitment to punishing offenders.

Diversions are sought after to punish offenders and to deter potential law violators. However, boot camps, moreso than other intermediate sanctions, appear to hold the promise of being a viable alternative since they have the potential to reform criminals by punishing them with physical pain, while simultaneously providing them an opportunity to become law-abiding. This twin effect satisfies both liberals and conservatives since it offers treatment and punishment. Because the boot camp literature is replete with studies on attitudinal changes among participants (see MacKenzie and Shaw 1990; MacKenzie, 1991; Hunter, Burton, Marquart, Cuvelier, 1992; Burton, Marquart, Cuvelier, Hunter,

and Fiftal, 1992), this chapter addresses a neglected area of shock incarceration -- the effect of attitudinal changes on recidivism levels. Since it is conventionally believed that changing offenders' attitude will somehow change their behavior, this chapter will test that hypothesis.

### **Shock Incarceration: An Overview**

Boot camp correctional programs are designed to provide nonviolent offenders, ages 17 through 26, with a "taste" of prison without housing them in the same facilities with older, more hardened criminals (Freeland, 1987). They are patterned after military boot camps, providing youthful offenders with stringent discipline and rigorous physical training and labor. One goal behind subjecting offenders to strict discipline, exercise, and intimidation is to remove the excuses they use to justify their behavior (Ratiff, 1988). Correctional experts contend that the shock incarceration experience offers young first-time offenders an opportunity to be diverted from a traditional sentence in exchange for serving a brief 90-day sentence within the confines of a paramilitary environment. After release, offenders must agree to abide by the conditions of parole.

Shock incarceration programs, such as boot camps, are located at traditional correctional facilities, which allow participants to see regular inmates without physical contact. It is expected that brief confinement in the program will "shock" the participants into understanding the harsh reality of prison life, without subjecting them to the effects of a long prison sentence. This reduces the chance of the offender becoming stigmatized and learning more criminal behavior that reduce any rehabilitative potential (Sykes, 1958). Boot camp is based on the theory that physical exertion and the military-style discipline will improve the physical health of offenders and instill order and discipline in their lives. According to Parent (1989), most shock incarceration programs also offer additional programs, such as counseling and adult education, which are further regarded as improving an offender's chances to succeed following release.

### **Monetary Incentives to Erect Boot Camps**

In an attempt to save states millions of dollars from having to construct new prisons, correctional officials are exploring alternatives to incarceration. Turque and Gonzales (1989) point out that overcrowded penitentiaries, the high cost of new prison construction, and an escalating tide of drug-related crime have lead some states to send young offenders to the correctional equivalent of boot camp. Parent (1989) also states that in recent years, shock incarceration (SI), or boot camp, has become a highly visible and popular new trend in corrections. MacKenzie and Shaw (1988) argue that boot camps are appealing because they require an offender to spend a relatively short term in a regulated prison environment followed by intensive supervision in the community. MacKenzie (1990) argues boot camps are politically attractive because they are cost effective and allow correctional and judicial officials to demonstrate a commitment to "getting tough" on offenders by subjecting them to harsh disciplinary actions.

The boot camp program is not only helpful to the offender, it may also lower costs for jurisdictions. For example, Arizona estimated savings of \$51 million over a five year period. Florida reported saving \$1.15 million per year. Illinois estimated savings of \$2.5 million because of shorter prison stays (Burns, 1993). Further, New York correctional officials estimate that boot camps have saved the public over \$90 million by not having to build new correctional facilities and \$80 million in operation costs because participants do not have long stays (Criminal Justice Newsletter, 1991).

Sound research has centered on the cost of operating boot camp programs versus traditional incarceration practices (Burns and Vito, 1995). Thus, according to Parent (1988), an incentive for developing shock incarceration programs is that they are a cost-effective means of reducing overcrowding. Shock incarceration saves potentially millions of dollars annually on prison sentences for offenders. MacKenzie, Gould, Riechers, and Shaw (1988) argued that this alternative to incarceration saves the state money since taking care of boot camp participants is cheaper than taking care of regular prison inmates. This alternative saves the state millions of dollars annually by partly alleviating the need for the state to build more prisons.

### **Arguments Favoring and Rejecting Boot Camps**

The idea of the military-type boot camp has ignited debate among practitioners, as well as criminal justice educators. On the one hand, supporters of boot camps argue that the short (usually 90 days) incarceration period, along with close supervision, avoids the problems of long periods of confinement. Sykes (1958) documented the pains of imprisonment, including the deprivation of liberty; goods and services; heterosexual relationships; autonomy; and security. He added that imprisonment leads inmates to engage in behavior within prison that reduces their prospects for post-release adjustment.

Opponents object to boot camps because participants are seemingly given a lenient sentence -- typically 90 days within a boot camp facility. Critics also contend that "net-widening" occurs in which the state extends its "web of social control" by placing individuals in boot camps who would otherwise have been placed on probation (Gordon, 1991). Some claim that a brief 90-day period is not long enough to have a positive impact on offenders and is usually implemented to help reduce prison overcrowding. MacKenzie (1990) notes that some criminal justice officials view shock incarceration as a promising alternative for controlling offenders who would otherwise be sentenced to probation, thus they explicitly favor net-widening through boot camp programs.

### **Boot Camps Increase in Number**

Hayeslip (1994) contends that there are 46 boot camp programs operating in 30 states with several other states considering their implementation. In addition, he claims the Bureau of Prisons operated two in 1993 at the same time juvenile camps were beginning to increase.

### **THE TEXAS MODEL**

The Courts Regimented Intensive Probation Program (CRIPP) was erected in May 1991 (Hunter, 1993). CRIPP, unlike many other boot camps, provides facilities that accommodate male and female offenders. However, they are segregated. It is believed that at any given period, CRIPP houses between 450 to 500 participants.

The CRIPP program is under the auspices of the Harris County (TX) Probation Department. Hunter (1993) notes that while at CRIPP, each participant is assigned to a probation officer who provides counseling

until the participant finishes the program. Furthermore, Hunter (1993) argues, security measures and general supervision are very much a part of the CRIPP ideal. The mere presence of security forces provided by the Harris County (TX) Sheriff's Department illustrates this point.

### **Program Organization**

The CRIPP facility is designed to supervise probationers for a 90-day period. Probationers arrive at the CRIPP program and are admitted to the Alpha (A) barracks. These Alpha (A) level barracks are used to house incoming participants until a group of 48 is admitted. The 90-day incarceration period does not begin until 48 offenders arrive. Participants who arrive at CRIPP before participation begins spend time learning military drill and ceremonies.

### **Services Provided to Probationers**

CRIPP participants are provided a range of services to meet medical, vocational, physical, and social (including drug and alcohol counseling) needs. For example, counseling services are provided by the Department of Probation to improve coping and life skills. The goals behind these services are to improve a probationer's ability to function in an independent and law-abiding fashion after release.

All probationers sentenced to the CRIPP program undergo an extensive medical examination prior to arrival. Once at CRIPP, probationers disclosing some physical limitations precluding their participation in the program, are further examined by a physician appointed by the Harris County Probation Department. Probationers with physical limitations, or who are medically incapable of participation, are referred back to the sentencing court. In addition, probationers are provided medical counseling services, which provides AIDS Awareness counseling to probationers. Under this service, probationers are given the opportunity to take an anonymous and voluntary HIV test; counseling is provided before and after taking the test to each person who takes the test.

Probationers are provided vocational training opportunities. For example, the CRIPP facility provides basic computer training for probationers -- thus, enabling them to apply for computer-related entry



level employment after release to the Super Intensive Probation Program (SIPP).

Paramilitary training, in the form of physical conditioning, occupies the majority of probationers' time in the program. A positive function accomplished by the CRIPP program is that its participants are physically fit; thus enhancing self-esteem and introducing probationers to training skills necessary to remain physically fit after release.

Probationers have the opportunity to receive drug and alcohol counseling. The goal behind these services is that receiving treatment will serve probationers in their attempt to end these habits, generate confidence and coping skills, and enable probationers to control their actions and break the cycle of chemical dependency.

Probationers completing the CRIPP program have been taught they are responsible for their actions. The CRIPP experience is designed to instill respect for the drill instructor and other authority figures. These attributes are conducive to leading a crime-free lifestyle once the defendant is released from the program. Additionally, through program involvement, probationers are taught to cope with stressful life situations which may arise.

## **ATTITUDINAL CHANGES AND RECIDIVISM LEVELS**

### **METHODOLOGY**

This study was conducted to determine attitudinal changes and recidivism outcome. The data for this study were collected over a four year period. To accomplish the task of determining what impact attitudinal changes have on levels of recidivism, the study used two instruments. These included a six-item survey (Harris County Lifestyle Survey) given to participants pre-and-post boot camp participation, and the Justice Information Management System (JIMS) for analyzing offenders' reinvolvement in crime. The sample for this analysis was chosen based on the number of participants who had graduated from CRIPP at the beginning of the study. The study uses a sample of 653.

### **Subjects**

This tracking investigation contains pre-and-post boot camp participation responses provided by a sample of 653 participants who shared like characteristics in terms of age; gender; education;

socioeconomic status; and criminality. The demographic characteristics of the boot camp participants are that they were all male; disproportionately African-American; averaged 19 years of age; had 10.2 years of education; and had committed personal, drug-related, and property offenses (see Table 5.1). Moreover, given that the sample had resided in the community for four years after release, this group had been exposed to the risks that follow being released and placed back in the offenders' regular environment. Therefore, the utility of the sentence type (i.e. boot camp) should be revealed through tracking. That is, this study will suggest if the boot camp sentence lessened rearrest after release to the community.

Table 5.1 Demographic Characteristics of CRIPP Participants  
(N=653)

Variable	Number
Race	
White	198
Hispanic	155
African-Americans	290
Other	10
Age (Mean)	19
Gender	All Male
Education Level (Mean)	10.2 Yrs
Offenses (Type)	
Personal	18.5%
Drugs	30.4%
Property	51.1%

## Measures

CRIPP's main function is to reduce the prison population by changing criminal offenders. Boot camp officials believe that the components offered by CRIPP will teach offenders responsibility, self-control, and the

discipline they need to change their attitude on life and enable them to remain law-abiding upon release. Therefore, CRIPP's philosophy is not to "coddle" offenders, but rather, to treat them harshly and therapeutically simultaneously. As a result, the survey instrument used to collect data from CRIPP participants focused on the offenders' lifestyles. It attempted to assess graduates' attitudes toward CRIPP and the impact on recidivism. As such, six programmatic areas were examined as the following variables: (1) Perception of boot camp staff; (2) drug and alcohol counseling; (3) perception of future opportunities; (4) general perception of the boot camp program; (5) impulsivity and self-control; and (6) family situation.

These variables were selected for investigation because MacKenzie and Shaw (1990); Hunter, et al. 1992; Burton, et al. 1992; and MacKenzie (1991) conducted research on similar areas which resulted in significant findings from attitudinal surveys of boot camp participants. Because of this, the overall objective of the investigation was to determine if significant changes in participants' attitudes would mean reduced levels of recidivism. Therefore, the instrument called *The Harris County Lifestyle Survey* was designed to make pre-and-post measures of items 1 through 6 in the Six Programmatic Areas. The items in the survey included the following: (1) What they have dishd out in here has made me not want to become a criminal; (2) Drug counseling has allowed me to kick my illegal drug use; (3) My chances for ever going to college are low; (4) The CRIPP training was not helpful; (5) I get impatient and begin to fume and fret when other people delay me unnecessarily; and (6) My present family life is bad (see Table 5.2 for results).

The surveys asked CRIPP participants to indicate their preference from a selection of answers that are provided from a Likert scale. Hagan (1989) and Champion (1993) explain that Likert scales are the most commonly used instruments in attitudinal research in criminology and the social sciences. Likert scales consist of a simple summation of usually a six-point bipolar response that ranges in intensity levels. More specifically, this scale has six items that includes: Strongly agree; agree; somewhat agree; somewhat disagree; disagree; and strongly disagree. The instruments were administered in a structured environment to maximize the level of respondent completion. To collect these data from boot camp participants, surveys were distributed by a research team made up of graduate students and criminal justice professors from Sam Houston State University located in Huntsville, Texas. These researchers

were given permission by CRIPP officials and were placed in complete charge of participants for the time needed to distribute and collect the surveys. Boot camp officials were not present at the time the survey was distributed. Members of the research team were briefed on some possible questions that the CRIPP participants might ask. The research team was advised to observe the paramilitary facility and training environment to ascertain ideas about what participants actually experience.

Completing the surveys was exceedingly time consuming considering that the researchers had to survey CRIPP participants at two important periods in the program - incoming and outgoing. However, in some instances, there were times when researchers were unable to survey all participants in their respective cohorts and had to rely on CRIPP officials to survey participants. There were several occasions where some participants were not available to be surveyed for various reasons that ranged from disciplinary to medical. Under these circumstances, officials were briefed on how to properly disseminate surveys and to objectively answer the participants' questions. For example, common questions centered on the purpose of the study and protecting their confidentiality.

JIMS was used to track the frequency of re-offending and recidivism by boot camp participants in Harris County, Texas. Stored in Harris County, the JIMS is a database that contains criminal histories on all offenders who have been processed by the Harris County, Texas Department of Criminal Justice - Institutional Division. Containing over 42 million records, it is considered the most extensive database system in the nation. This system operates by assigning each offender a system number that follows him from the beginning of his incarceration to his disposition. Because JIMS issues an identification number to each offender, it is relatively easy to discover if offenders have had further contact with the criminal justice system.

The tracking begins when the researcher inserts the offender's identification number into JIMS; it will then alert the researchers of all the offender's additional criminal actions. The JIMS system provides access to all dates (and changes of official status) of technical violations, new arrests (and the offense); new convictions; jail sentences; and sentences to the Texas prison system (see Table 5.3 for results of the tracking investigation). JIMS makes it relatively easy to track an offender by alerting the monitor of any contact that the offender has had within the Texas Department of Criminal Justice - Institutional Division.

## FINDINGS

The sample was exclusively male. The average age was 19 years. The average number of formal years of education completed was 10.2. The sample composition was disproportionately African-American, with Whites, Hispanics, and others, respectively. Responses from the attitudinal measures revealed that Variable 1 has an incoming mean of 5.40 and an outgoing mean of 5.15 with a T-ratio of 4.20\*. Variable 2 has an incoming mean of 3.42 and an outgoing mean of 4.70 with a T-ratio of -12.52\*. Variable 3 has an incoming mean of 4.13 and an outgoing mean of 4.58 with a T-ratio of -6.89\*. Variable 4 has an incoming mean of 1.97 and an outgoing mean of 1.55 with a T-ratio of 9.27\*. Variable 5 has an incoming mean of 3.54 and an outgoing mean of 3.41 with a T-ratio of 6.39\*. Variable 6 has an incoming mean of 2.26 and an outgoing mean of 2.09 with a T-ratio of 4.69\*. The T-ratio for all six variables is significant at the .05 level or  $p < .05$  (Also see Burton et al., 1992). The *t*-ratio is used to test a hypothesis about the difference between population means. It also assumes that the population  $\sigma$ 's are the same. Therefore, the *t* distributions are based on the assumption that the characteristics being measured is normally distributed in the populations from which the samples were drawn. It is a special case of ANOVA for two groups or levels of a treatment variable.

The results of the four year tracking investigation through JIMS reveal that of the 653 CRIPP participants, 62.1% recidivated, while 37.9% still remain in the free community. Those who were arrested, convicted, and sentenced committed crimes that were categorized as either personal, property, drug, or traffic. JIMS indicated that of the recidivists, personal offenses accounted for 9%, property 17.3%, drug 16.2%, and traffic 19.6%.

## RESULTS

The hypothesis tested was not supported by the data. Attitudinal changes and reduced levels of recidivism are not related. While using the *t*-test of significance on the six programmatic areas and comparing the findings with reported levels of recidivism, though there are significant attitudinal changes, they do not have a long-term effect that prevent offenders from re-engaging in crime (See Table 5. 3). The results from this investigation reveal that attitudinal changes have little long-term effect on boot camp offenders' behavior.

## DISCUSSION

Many correctional experts, scholars, politicians, and citizens embrace the use of shock incarceration as a viable alternative to traditional incarceration. They contend that these programs reduce the numbers of offenders entering the system, help strained correctional budgets, and allow limited bed space for "real" criminals. The sentiments held by these advocates have largely been supported by research reporting significant attitudinal changes. As mentioned earlier, there have been many studies examining the attitudinal changes made by shock incarceration participants (see MacKenzie and Shaw, 1990; MacKenzie, 1991; Hunter, et al., 1992; and Burton, et al., 1992), but what these studies have failed to address are the effects of attitudinal changes over time (see Hayeslip, 1994). This tracking investigation demonstrates that attitudinal changes do not promise lower levels of recidivism in the long term. The recidivism rate of 62.1% supports this conclusion. One irony of boot camps could be that they have the unintended effect of costing states more since those who have recidivated will have to face a regular prison sentence, thereby, costing states for both the boot camp experience and a traditional sentence.

It was originally thought in Variable 1 that if participants indicated that they perceived the boot camp experience as difficult, it would have discouraged them from becoming criminals. Despite positive attitudinal changes in this variable, the rate of recidivism proved contrary. The Criminal Justice Policy Council (1992) contends that drug use is very common among offenders. Nearly 87% of offenders in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice - Institutional Division have reported that they have tried at least one drug. At least 62% of offenders reported using drugs within 24 hours prior to committing a crime. Therefore, drug use has an established presence in crime and a possible adverse effect on recidivism rates. Variable 2 (drug/alcohol counseling) has significant effects on the incoming and outgoing means. It was thought that since offenders were provided treatment and counseling this would help reduce crime influenced by drug/alcohol usage.

In Variable 3, participants indicated that they could not imagine ever attending college, but instead, did reveal that they favored hard work and would try to get a job upon release. This indicated that the CRIPP program was successful in instilling participants with the desire to engage in conventional lifestyles and divert them from a life of crime.

However, while respondents reported significant attitudinal changes, this failed to prevent them from re-engaging in crime. This is a salient aspect of CRIPP because many of its participants lack consistent or conventional employment histories. Variable 4 revealed that the participants did not perceive the program as beneficial. If the participants viewed the program as not being helpful, they could have eased their way through the training while not being affected by the treatment of the program. While examining the results on recidivism, this seems to be what was demonstrated in the long term.

Variable 5 measured impulsiveness and self-control among offenders. Scholars, such as Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) and Wilson and Herrnstein (1985), have consistently argued that those who lack self-control will continue to violate the law if given the opportunity. CRIPP and its various treatment programs are designed to refute this contention by teaching offenders control mechanisms that emphasize verbal, rather than physical, dispute resolutions. It was hoped that the CRIPP military-style training would teach offenders patience, self control, and a general understanding and respect for the law. Despite the indicators from the attitudinal surveys, offenders still reoffended. Variable 6 asked offenders if they thought their family life induced them into crime. This was posed because CRIPP officials believe that the stress of everyday life could influence crime. As a result, offenders were provided coping skills. While they reported significant attitudinal changes after receiving treatment and counseling, the inference was that they would not commit crimes because of the stressors of family life. Yet, the recidivism levels demonstrate the contrary. While these conclusions appear bleak, perhaps they should be accepted with caution.

After CRIPP, participants are placed in the Super Intensive Probation Program (SIPP). SIPP provides aftercare services to help participants successfully reintegrate into their respective communities. The quality of aftercare programs could determine if participants will remain law-abiding. SIPP provides intensive supervision and monitoring services. Some programs require offenders to participate in community services; report to probation officers; take random drug tests; seek additional counseling; and adhere to curfews. Moreover, SIPP assists probationers in locating employment.

While SIPP has many good qualities, it should work directly with the CRIPP program to assess its goals with those of CRIPP and the offenders' needs. This investigation revealed that initially CRIPP had a positive effect that dissipated over time. Therefore, it is the authors'

contention that the CRIPP program can have a positive impact and does have a tremendous immediate impact that tends to disappear over time. This could be caused by CRIPP participants returning to their original environment after release. Many participants come from impoverished areas characterized by excessive gun availability; gangs; drugs; random violence; low educational attainment; joblessness; hopelessness; depression; and social disorganization. Upon completion of CRIPP, many face few legitimate job prospects that make a life of crime attractive. Perhaps, CRIPP, SIPP, and other social agencies should address these issues.

Another finding from this study revealed that 42% of CRIPP participants recidivated by committing either a personal, property, or a drug offense, while nearly 20% recidivated after committing a traffic violation (see Table 5.3). This finding is disturbing. Perhaps rearresting boot camp offenders for a traffic violation is too punitive for such a small infraction since such a violation is typically considered a misdemeanor. However, JIMS does not report why traffic arrests were made. One does not know if the offenders were under the influence of alcohol or mind-altering drugs, possessed narcotics, a weapon, or were driving without a license. Further research should be conducted on this area of CRIPP recidivists.

Attitudinal changes which are short-term should be viewed cautiously in view of the recidivism data, which are long term. Recidivism is still the best measure of a correctional treatment approach since it speaks volumes to a program's success or failure. Attitudinal changes are always measured through the pre-and post- participation or involvement approach, and are not indicative of long range success or failure.

### Discussion Questions

1. Do boot camps have the potential to save money? If so, how?
2. What are the arguments in favor of or rejecting boot camps?
3. What is unique about the Texas CRIPP program?
4. Can attitudinal changes predict recidivism for boot camp participants over time? Explain.
5. What is potentially a major shortcoming of JIMS?



**Key Terms**

attitudinal changes  
conditions of parole  
cost-effective  
Courts Regimented Intensive Probation Program (CRIPP)  
Criminal Justice Policy Council  
Harris County Lifestyles Survey  
intensive probation supervision  
Justice Information Management System (JIMS)  
post-release adjustment  
Six Programmatic Areas  
Super Intensive Probation Program (SIPP)

**REFERENCES**

- Anderson, J. F. and Dyson, L. (1996). A tracking investigation to determine boot camp success and offender risk assessment for CRIPP participants. *Journal of Crime and Justice*. Vol. 19(1): 179-190.
- Burns, J. (1993). A comparative evaluation of the Alabama department of corrections' boot camp program. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama.
- Burns, J. and Vito, G. (1995). "An impact analysis of the Alabama boot camp program." *Federal Probation*, (March) 63-67.
- Burton, Jr., V. S., Marquart, J. W., Cuvelier, S., Hunter, R., and Fiftal, L. (1992). "The Harris County Courts Regimented Intensive Probation Program (CRIPP)." An outline for a program evaluation assessing correctional effectiveness. *Texas Probation* (forthcoming).
- Champion, D. J. (1993). *Research methods for criminal justice and criminology*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Freeland, D. (1987). "Money for boot camps at issue: Prison, state officials at odds over funds availability." *The Houston Post*, December 28.

- Gordon, D. (1991). *The justice juggernaut: Fighting street crime, controlling citizens*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Gottfredson, M. and Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hagan, F. (1989). *Research methods in criminal justice and criminology*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Hayeslip, D. W. (1994). "Correctional boot camps: Promise and pitfall". A paper presented at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences.
- Hunter, R. J. (1993). *Shock incarceration: An impact assessment measuring attitudinal changes in the Harris County, Texas Courts Regimented Probation Program*. (Unpublished dissertation, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas).
- Hunter, R. J., Burton, V. S., Marquart, J. W., and Cuvelier, S. J. (1992). "Measuring attitudinal change of boot camp participants." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*. 8(4): 283-297.
- MacKenzie, D. (1990). "Boot camp prisons: Components, evaluations, and empirical issues." *Federal Probation*, (September) 44-52.
- MacKenzie, D. (1991). "Boot camp programs grow in number and scope." *NIJ Reports*. US Department of Justice (November/December) 221.
- MacKenzie, D., Gould, L., Riechers, L., and Shaw, J. (1988). "Shock Incarceration: Rehabilitation or rehabilitation? The Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation. Indiana.
- MacKenzie, D. and Shaw, J. (1988). "Inmate adjustment and change during shock incarceration," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Chicago.
- MacKenzie, D. and Shaw, J. (1990). "Inmates' adjustment and change during shock incarceration: The impact of correctional boot camp programs." *Justice Quarterly*. (March): 125-50.

Parent, D. (1988). "Shock incarceration programs." American Probation and Parole Association. National Institute of Justice, 14 Perspectives. Fall.

Parent, D. (1989). Shock incarceration: An overview of existing program. National Institute of Justice: Issues and Practices. June.

Ratiff, B. (1988). "The army model: Boot camp for youthful offenders." Corrections Today. December.

Recidivism in the Texas criminal justice system: Sentencing dynamics study, Report 5 (1992). Criminal Justice Policy Council. Austin, Texas.

Sykes, G. (1958). The society of captives: A study of a maximum security prison. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

"Texas legislature considered more prisons and alternatives." Criminal Justice Newsletter. 22 (1 August 1991): 4.

Turque, B. and Gonzales, D. (1989). "Experiments in boot camp: Do military-style programs help young offenders?" Newsweek. May 22.

Wilson, J.Q. and Herrnstein, R. J. (1985). Crime & Human Nature: The definitive study of the causes of crime. New York: Simon & Schuster Publishers.

Table 5.2 Attitudinal Changes as Predictors of the Six Programmatic Areas Using t-test of Significance

<u>Variables</u>		
1. Perceptions of boot camp staff		
What they have dished out in here has made me not want to become a criminal.		
Incoming Mean 5.40	Outgoing Mean 5.15	T-Ratio 4.20*
2. Drugs and alcohol counseling		
Drug counseling has allowed me to kick my illegal drug use.		
Incoming Mean 3.42	Outgoing Mean 4.70	T-Ratio -12.52*
3. Perceptions of future opportunities		
My chances for ever going to college are low.		
Incoming Mean 4.13	Outgoing Mean 4.58	T-Ratio -6.89*
4. General perception of boot camp program		
The CRIPP training was not helpful.		
Incoming Mean 1.97	Outgoing Mean 1.55	T-Ratio 9.27*
5. Impulsivity and self-control		
I get impatient and begin to fume and fret when other people delay me unnecessarily.		
Incoming Mean 3.54	Outgoing Mean 3.41	T-Ratio 6.39*

6. Family situation		
My present family life is bad.		
Incoming Mean	Outgoing Mean	T-Ratio
2.26	2.09	4.69*

\*significant at the .05 or  $p<.05$

Table 5.3 JIMS Assessment of the 653 CRIPP Offenders After A Four Year Period

Recidivists 62.1%	Non-recidivists 37.9%
Type of Offenses Committed After Release	
Personal	09.0%
Property	17.3%
Drug	16.2%
Traffic	19.6%

## CHAPTER 6

---

### **A Four Year Tracking Investigation on Boot Camp Participants: A Study of Recidivism Outcome**

Boot camps emerged in the 1980s as a viable alternative to long-term imprisonment (Burns, 1990; MacKenzie, 1990; and Parent, 1989). MacKenzie and Souryal (1995) argue that shock incarceration programs have become a common correctional option since a decade ago. For example, Bourque, Han, and Hill (1996) contend that 52 boot camp programs exist in the United States and thirty of them opened after 1991. However, since their inception, scholars have debated whether shock incarceration programs are an effective means of punishment. At present, the evidence needed to support that boot camps effectively reduce prison overcrowding and lower correctional costs is sparse and inconsistent. As some critics claim, some boot camps are effective while others are not.

While some experts argue shock incarceration programs will reduce recidivism, others lack their enthusiasm and argue that programs patterned after military basic training that teach aggressiveness cannot have positive effects on deterrence or rehabilitation (Morash and Rucker, 1990). Instead, they argue that these programs could make offenders more violent than they were before the quasi-military experience. Critics of shock incarceration programs contend that the empirical evidence demonstrating a rehabilitative or deterrent effect is lacking. This is argued because there have been very few studies conducted that specifically examined boot camp participants'

This is a revision of an article previously published in *The Justice Professional* 10:199-213. Copyright (c) 1997 by OPA (Overseas Publishers Associate) Amsterdam B.V. Reprinted with permission of Gordon and Breach Publishers.

recidivism levels. Further, they argue that boot camps could invariably meet the same end as former diversions, such as shock probation and scared straight programs. Stated another way, boot camps could prove to be yet another failed program in the criminal justice arsenal that expand the nets of incarceration. This chapter focuses on the Texas boot camp model, CRIPP, and assessing its level of recidivism after closely following participants for a four year tracking period.

### **THE TEXAS BOOT CAMP MODEL -- CRIPP**

Confronted by an increasing prison population, overcrowding, and budgetary constraints in 1989, the Texas Department of Criminal Justice - Institutional Division (TDCJ-ID) enacted Senate Bill 245. The bill created paramilitary training programs to be used as a sentencing option in place of traditional forms of incarceration. More specifically, Senate Bill 245 provided TDCJ-ID the authority to establish 90-day programs as a condition of probation. However, it required that participation in boot camp would hinge on a diagnostic evaluation. The rationale was that since boot camp participants engage in physical activities, medical doctors must be satisfied that inmates are physically and psychologically capable of enduring the rigors associated with the process. In addition, participants must be between the ages of 17 and 26 and have never served time in prison for having committed a felony.

TDCJ-ID's intended purposes were to teach offenders team work; respect for themselves, as well as for their fellow inmates; instill discipline; and provide them with tools to make them functional and productive members of society. The state reasoned that these programs would help reduce prison overcrowding and alleviate the need for constructing additional prisons. The Bill ultimately led to the erection of units, such as SAIP (Sentencing Alternative Intensive Program) and CRIPP. However, this chapter focuses on CRIPP.

Because participants are not noted for compliance, security measures are also taken at CRIPP. The Harris County Sheriff's Department, along with correctional personnel, provides security and treatment needed to ensure that the offenders' boot camp experience will be rehabilitative and meaningful. CRIPP officials feel that the presence of security officers will help to instill in participants the respect for authority and "law and order" that many of them lack. Hunter (1993) argues that security measures and general supervision

are very much a part of the CRIPP ideal. The mere presence of security forces provided by the Harris County Sheriff's Department illustrates this point. Security assignment to CRIPP is based solely on volunteers.

The CRIPP program is based on a military model. Therefore, security forces assigned to the program must adhere to a militaristic approach when dealing with boot camp participants. For example, the supervision personnel (security) follow a militaristic chain of command. The chain is composed of a hierarchy that includes a Command Sergeant Major, a Duty Sergeant, and Drill Instructors.

Since the Command Sergeant Major is highest in the chain of command, he has several important responsibilities. First, he reports to officials at the Harris County Sheriff's Department. He has charge over drill instructors and facility security and provides military training to probationers. However, the command sergeant major does not act alone. For instance, Hunter (1993) reports that within the boot camp program, an Assistant Director oversees additional programs (e.g. vocational, medical, and counseling services) in which probationers participate.

### **Life in the Program**

Once 48 probationers form a cohort in the Alpha barrack, the group is moved to the first available "program" barrack. Participants are assigned to one of the five barrack cohorts: 1) Charlie (C); 2) Delta (D); 3) Fox-trot (F); 4) Golf (G); and 5) Hotel (H). As soon as the assignment is made, the 90-day program goes into effect (Hunter, 1993).

Typically, a participant's day begins at 4 a.m. with a call to breakfast followed by physical training. Lunch is served at 11 a.m. and is followed by more physical training, barracks clean-up, and other orders. Dinner is served at 3 p.m. and is followed by more rigorous physical training. The day ends with lights out at 10 p.m. (Hunter, 1993).

Once a cohort is in place, each barrack forms a "chain of command." One probationer is assigned as a guide for the entire barrack, while four other probationers are named squad leaders for the barrack. Within the barrack, each probationer must use the "chain of



command" (e.g., his squad leader, the barrack guide, and finally, the drill instructor) to make requests (Hunter, 1993).

Hunter (1993) notes that within the first week of entering one of the five possible program barracks, the probationers are issued a military desert pattern Battle Dress Uniform, or BDU. Hunter argues that wearing the BDU instills pride in the probationer and in the program barrack. This uniform also distinguishes entry-level probationers from more advanced program level participants. Once the probationers enter the final stages of their program barrack, they are issued a different BDU -- more specifically, a woodland camo uniform and a pair of combat boots. This uniform further distinguishes levels attained by probationers. This final uniform will be worn on graduation day when successful probationers march and perform various drill and ceremony exercises for their family, CRIPP personnel, and invited guests (Hunter, 1993).

### **CRIPP's Main Components**

The main components of the CRIPP program are marching and disciplining; physical training; working; substance abuse treatment; individual and group counseling; plus life skills training. Each component is looked upon as being an intricate part of the boot camp function and is designed to bring about rehabilitation of the participants. The purposes of the Texas boot camp program are not just to punish the offender, cut prison costs, and reduce prison crowding, but most importantly, to serve as a chance for rehabilitation.

### **Marching and Discipline**

Military drills and ceremonies are an integral part of the CRIPP operation. These are used to instill in the participants the feelings of discipline, accomplishment, and unity. Each day, the participants engage in marching, which requires group effort. They are required to practice and work together to learn the drills that are commanded to them. Therefore, when this is accomplished, they feel good about themselves. Also, the military setting requires a large amount of discipline and respect for authority from the participants. Because it is felt that the lack of discipline was partly responsible for their placement in the boot camp, instilling it is pivotal in the treatment

process. It is widely believed that after this paramilitary experience, the participants will have discipline, respect for authority, and the ability to make the correct choices when they are released into the free community.

### **Physical Training**

Physical fitness is taken very seriously at CRIPP. It is mandatory for all probationers to participate in PT daily. Physical training is designed to improve the offender. Since it is thought that some offenders entering boot camp have used alcohol and drugs, it is believed that the rigors of exercise could have a cleansing effect on them.

One purpose behind this regimen is to increase the development of the cardiorespiratory system and the leg muscles through push ups, sit ups, and jogging. The confidence obstacle course is another component used by the Texas system. This course is designed to help participants become confident and positive about their mental and physical capacity to accomplish tasks they attempt. This course tests the participants' ability to make quick and accurate decisions, as well as assess their physical agility. Hunter (1993) argues that physical training at CRIPP is also used as a punishment when drill instructors are dissatisfied with participants. In some instances, the entire group could be punished for the shortcomings of a single participant. Punishing all participants for the misdeeds of a few is used to command conformity from all in the training process. This also teaches unity among participants. While these exercises are taking place, the participants are being closely watched by drill instructors.

### **Work**

Work is a mandatory component of this boot camp. Each offender must engage in work without protest. Work is viewed as being essential, for if the offender had been in the habit of working each day, he would not have violated the law, and this brief period of incarceration could have been avoided. Accordingly, boot camp attempts to get the participant into the habit of working each day in hope that upon release he will retain what was learned and seek employment. The work performed at CRIPP is mostly agricultural.

However, some probationers are assigned to work groups that are in charge of ground maintenance, laundry details, janitorial duties, etc. Participants work at least five days a week while engaging in their usual drills and ceremonies, exercises, and attending classes. A portion of their Sunday is spent in worship.

### **Substance Abuse Treatment**

CRIPP uses classroom time to convey the dangers associated with drug abuse. Participants are made aware of the adverse affects drugs have on their lives and on others. This treatment program attempts to convince participants to remain drug free and inform them of the adverse physical and psychological impact that drugs have on them. Instructors seize this opportunity to remind some of the participants that illegal substances landed them in CRIPP. Moreover, substance abuse treatment is continued through the aftercare given to the offender after his release from CRIPP. Offenders are made aware that they can get help from residential probation programs, under intensive supervision programs or regular probation supervision.

### **Individual and Group Counseling**

Individual and group counseling go "hand-in-hand" with the substance abuse treatment component. This particular phase has two parts. First, it is used to get the offender to admit and accept that he has a problem with illegal substances. Here, offenders are made aware of manifestations of drug addiction (obsessions, compulsion, denial, etc.). Offenders are primarily introduced to coping strategies. In Phase One, offenders will undergo individual counseling sessions. However, in Phase Two, volunteers from Phase One, relate their personal experiences of "fighting" and coping with drug addiction. This phase attempts to establish a bond so that participants will become more open, realize they are not alone and that others have successfully overcome addictions or are overcoming them. This session addresses "tough" issues such as self-worth; acceptance; self-awareness; family systems; and societal demands, responses, and values.

## **Life Skills Training**

At CRIPP, the probationers are constantly taught self-improvement skills. In the life-skills training process, participants are introduced to social training skills; employment skills; stress reduction skills; personal and family relationship instructions; and basic literacy skills. In these classes, the participants are introduced to preventive measures for sexually transmitted diseases and personal safety tips. These courses are usually taught in classrooms where participants are closely monitored and are encouraged to participate and respond to instructors.

## **ASSESSING RECIDIVISM IN THE FREE COMMUNITY**

After experiencing the paramilitary training for three months, participants of CRIPP are placed on intensive probation. Penal authorities in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice - Institutional Division view intensive probation supervision as necessary, since statistics demonstrate that boot camp graduates are most vulnerable shortly after their release. Probationers must then make routine (weekly) visits to their probation officers and report what is occurring in their lives. Furthermore, probationers must submit to random drug testing that is basically given at the discretion of their probation officer. Several months later, if the offenders have made a positive adjustment, they are placed on regular probation, which is far less intrusive. Despite being placed in a less intensive probation program, they must still report to their probation officer and be held accountable for conditions of probation.

## **Criminal Factors Shaping Recidivism**

Wallerstedt (1984) argues that because of safety needs and a desire to control high levels of recidivism, preventing and reducing recidivism has always been of extreme importance to policy makers, administrators, and criminal justice experts. As such, recidivism is important since many of the offenders who are released will inevitably return to prison. For example, the U.S. Department of Justice estimates that nearly 30 percent of the offenders who are released are returned to prison for either committing an additional crime or a technical violation (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1984). Further,

Wallerstedt (1984) reports that there are identifiable features that appeared in a multi-state examination of recidivism. The research reveals that recidivism was highly influenced by demographic characteristics such as age, gender, and race. He observed that offenders in Massachusetts under the age of 25 have recidivism rates of 31 percent, while those between 25 and 29 had rates of 28 percent. However, for those 30 and older, recidivism rates were only 17 percent. Gender is also a salient predictor of recidivism: Wallerstedt contends that in New York, 36 percent of males return to prison while 12.1 percent of women return. Race is another predictor of recidivism. For instance, he discovered that in California, blacks have recidivism rates disproportionate to whites, at 27.9 percent and 33.5 percent, respectively.

Other important criminal factors that shape recidivism, as argued by Samaha (1994) include: (1) Nearly 60 percent of offenders sentenced to prison for a first-time offense have at one time been convicted of committing a crime for which they were placed on probation; (2) If they would have served their prior maximum sentence, nearly 42 percent would have still been in prison at the time of rearrest; and (3) More than 33 percent of prisoners are sent back to prison after completing the supervision period following release. Furthermore, Ribner and Steadman (1981) argue that ex-offenders have consistently higher levels of recidivism than others.

Morris and Tonry (1990) contend that if recidivism levels are low, correctional policy is thought to be effective in deterring crime and reducing expensive correctional cost. However, if correctional policies result in high rates of recidivism, or higher than would be true for alternatives, the program used would be considered ineffective in reducing recidivism. Recidivism findings are exceedingly significant because they affect correctional policy. Recidivism occurs when the released offender is rearrested, reconvicted, and returned to prison. However, recidivism is not limited only to committing additional crimes. For example, offenders could recidivate by violating a technical condition of probation or parole. In this chapter, we track offenders to determine if they have been reconvicted since being released into the free community.

## METHODOLOGY

### Subjects

This study was conducted with 653 (all male) boot camp graduates released at the end of 1992 to determine CRIPP's effectiveness. Data for this investigation were collected over a two year period. To determine levels of recidivism, criminal records were analyzed to assess CRIPP participants' reinvolved in crime after release from the boot camp facility. The sample for this analysis was chosen from participants who graduated from CRIPP at the time of the study. Those in the sample shared similar characteristics such as age; gender; education; socio-economic status; and criminality. When this study began in 1994, the sample participants had already been released into and re-exposed to their "pre-conviction" environment for two years. Therefore, the effectiveness of the boot camp sentence could be determined by tracking the behavior of the sample. That is, this study will indicate if a sentence to boot camp prevented offenders from becoming reinvolved in crime after they were released to the community. JIMS was used to track the reoffending by boot camp participants.

## FINDINGS

This study examined a group of boot camp graduates to determine levels of recidivism. We assessed recidivism of CRIPP graduates who had been released into the free community for nearly four years. We used statistical application to determine the demographic characteristics and recidivism rates of the 653 participants.

Table 6.1 Gender of CRIPP Participants

	Frequency	Percent
Male	653	100
Female	0	0

Table 6.1 reveals that the participants in this investigation were all males.

Table 6.2 Race Distribution of CRIPP Participants

	Frequency	Percent
White	230	35.2
Hispanic	125	19.1
Afro-American	291	44.6
Others	7	1.1
	653	100.0

Table 6.2 shows that whites made up 35.2% of the sample while Hispanics totaled 19.1%. African-Americans were disproportionately represented at 44.6%, and others combined for 1.1%.

Table 6.3 Marital Status of CRIPP Participants

	Frequency	Percent
Single	390	59.7
Married	175	26.8
Separated	43	6.6
Divorced	15	2.3
Widowed	14	2.2
Missing	16	2.4
	653	100.0

\*valid cases for this observation equals 637. Therefore, percent total does not equal 100%.

Table 6.3 indicates that participants were disproportionately single (59.7%). Those who were married represented 26.8% of the sample. Participants separated from their spouses totaled 6.6%. The percentages of divorced and widowed participants were significantly low at 2.3% and 2.2%, respectively.

Table 6.4 Age of CRIPP Participants

	Frequency	Percentage
17	114	17.5
18	150	23.0
19	129	19.8
20	72	11.0
21	58	8.9
22	46	7.0
23	35	5.4
24	26	4.0
25	17	2.6
Missing	6	.8
	653	

\*valid cases for this observation equals 647. Therefore, percent total does not equal 100%.

Table 6.4 shows that participants age 17 represented 17.5% of the sample. Those age 18 represented 23%. Participants age 19 accounted for 19.8%. Eleven percent of the sample was 20, while 8.9% was age 21. Moreover, participants age 22 accounted for 7%. Twelve percent was represented by ages 23, 24, and 25 with 5.4, 4, and 2.6 percent, respectively.



Table 6.5 Completed Level of Education of CRIPP Participants

Education	Frequency	Percent
6	6	.9
7	4	.4
8	48	7.4
9	135	20.7
10	163	25.0
11	144	21.1
12	103	15.8
13	30	4.6
14	9	1.6
15	4	.6
16	1	.2
17	1	.2
Missing	5	1.5

\*valid cases for this observation equals 648. Therefore, percent total does not equal 100%.

Table 6.5 reveals that participants with an educational attainment of the sixth grade made up .9% of the sample. Those who completed the seventh grade totaled .4%, and those with an eighth grade education accounted for 7.4%. Significantly high percentages were found among those who completed the ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades, which are listed at 20.7%; 25%; 21.1%; and 15.8%, respectively. Those who received thirteen years totaled 4.6%, while those with fourteen years totaled 1.4%. Participants having fifteen, sixteen, and seventeen years of education represented .6%,.2%, and .2%, respectively.

A Four Year Tracking Investigation on Boot Camp 79  
Participants: A Study of Recidivism Outcome

**Table 6.6 Offenses Committed After CRIPP**

	Frequency	Percent
Burglary	54	8.3
Robbery	18	2.8
Sex	2	.6
Drugs	105	16.2
Traffic	128	19.6
Theft	54	8.7
Forgery	1	.5
Assault	38	5.8
No Violations	245	37.5
Missing	3	100.0

\*valid cases for this observation equals 650. Therefore, percent total does not equal 100%.

Table 6.6 shows that 8.3% of the boot camp failures committed burglary, 2.8% committed robbery and .6% committed sex offenses. Drug violations accounted for 16.2% and traffic violations accounted for a substantial 19.6%. Theft crimes represented 8.7%, while forgery represented .5% of the reoffenses. Assault accounted for 5.8%, while 37.5% of the sample did not reoffend.

**Table 6.7 Type of Offense**

	Percent
Personal	9.1
Property	17.3
Drug	16.2
Traffic	19.6
No Violations	37.8

Table 6.7 indicates that 9% of the reoffenses were personal crimes, 17.3% were property crimes, and 16.2% were drug crimes while 19.6% offenders violated traffic laws. CRIPP participants who did not reoffend totaled 37.8%.

Table 6.8 Non-Recidivists and Recidivists

	Frequency	Percent
Non-Recidivist	24.5	37.5
Recidivist	40.3	61.7
Missing	.5	.8

Table 6.8 shows that 61.7% recidivated while 37.5% have not re-entered the Texas Department of Criminal Justice - Institutional Division.

## DISCUSSION

This tracking investigation reveals that after being released for four years, 61.7 percent of the participants in this CRIPP study recidivated. Therefore, the sentence to shock incarceration in this investigation appears to have done more harm than good since the participants who recidivated are now serving a traditional sentence. As a result, Texas taxpayers who defrayed the cost of the CRIPP program have the added burden of paying to have many of the CRIPP offenders in this investigation serve a regular sentence in a traditional prison setting. This comes as sad news for the Texas Criminal Justice Department - Institutional Division since it has already been reported that in 1994, 28.5% and 28.6% of probationers and parolees, respectively, had recidivated after the first two years of release (Anderson, 1995). Thus, the problems of overcrowding and high prison costs are not resolved. Despite CRIPP's apparent failure, this investigation reveals significant findings for Texas judicial officials and states that are considering implementing boot camp as an intermediate sanction.

An examination of the 653 CRIPP participants indicates that 70.8 percent of the participants were not married. Shock incarceration programs overwhelmingly target offenders who are young and impressionable. This increases the possibility that many participants will be unmarried. Some critics charge that this could be an early indicator of program failure and recidivism. For example, Sampson and Laub (1990) have found an inverse relationship between personal commitment through marriage and deviant and criminal behaviors. Thus, they contend that being married could reduce one's criminal

involvement. Others argue that those who are single have lifestyles that are conducive for crime and victimization. This is supported by the results in this tracking investigation since those who were unmarried recidivated more (see Table 6.9).

Table 6.9 Recidivists Marital Status

Non-married	93.3%
Married	6.7%

One explanation for the disparity could be that probationers who are married are more responsible and mature with stronger bonds to their families and other conventional lifestyles. Perhaps boot camps would be more effective if they targeted offenders with marital attachments.

A significant finding in this investigation that needs addressing is the age of participants. Age is a salient factor in recidivism as indicated by this study and other research (see Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990; Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985). Participants in this investigation were between the ages of 17 and 25. However, the largest margin of failure was found among those who were 17 through 21 years of age. The boot camp literature is replete with findings on levels of recidivism and age (see Anderson and Dyson, 1996; Burns and Vito, 1995; Anderson, 1995). High levels of recidivism could be an inevitable consequence since shock incarceration programs target young offenders. Research indicates that young offenders, unlike older ones who receive this diversion, fail to recognize shock incarceration as a reprieve from a traditional sentence (Anderson and Dyson, 1996). As a result, young offenders re-engage in crime more frequently. If strained state correctional systems truly desire to reduce high levels of recidivism and the exuberant number of offenders from entering the prison system, they would do well to target older offenders who might be married and take advantage of the boot camp sentence.

Another finding from this investigation that could be crucial to explaining recidivism is educational attainment. Sources report that lower educational levels are positively associated with increased recidivism (Criminal Justice Newsletter, 1991). Moreover, 60 percent of Texas prisoners are illiterate and lack employment opportunities, social mobility, culturally-valued ideas, and problem-solving skills

upon release (see Criminal Justice Newsletter, 1991). The lack of educational attainment could push many offenders into a life of crime after release if they are unable to find meaningful and rewarding employment. This investigation found that 60 percent of the CRIPP recidivists self-reported having educational attainments that varied from sixth through tenth grade. Boot camps would do well to stress educational attainment and employment skills.

Yet another concern about the CRIPP findings was the type of new offenses that were committed by offenders after a four year period. These offenses were categorized as personal, property, drug, and traffic (see Table 6.10). Of the recidivists in the sample, those who committed a personal offense accounted for 15 percent, property offenders accounted for 28 percent, while drug offenders accounted for 26 percent. Despite this, traffic violations were committed more often than other crimes and accounted for 31 percent. Perhaps shock incarceration is not a suitable alternative for property and drug offenders since they recidivate more than others (Anderson, Carson and Dyson, 1995; Anderson and Dyson, 1996). After CRIPP, participants are placed on Super Intensive Probation Program.

Table 6.10 Recidivists and New Offenses and Percentages

New Offenses	Percentages
Personal	15%
Property	28%
Drugs	26%
Traffic	31%
N=61.7	Total=100%

While the Texas boot camp program could have a lasting effect on probationers when they are initially placed on SIPP, the effects that bind them toward conformity tend to dissipate after offenders are released from probation. This is revealed through this four year investigation. Perhaps additional work should be done that ensures that aftercare programs have a more lasting effect or that participants receive quality aftercare programs. However, the percentage of recidivism due to traffic violations cannot be overstated. Again, JIMS

should certainly attempt to do a better job of explaining the nature and circumstances surrounding all arrests connected with routine traffic stops. Such high percentages (31%) of offenders reentering the Texas criminal justice system demands nothing short of a detailed explanation.

While the general belief is that boot camps help states save limited bed space and relieve states from constructing new prisons to accommodate increasing numbers of prisoners, this chapter does not support that contention. This does not mean that other boot camps are not meeting their goals. Perhaps the CRIPP experience is unique. It is the contention of the authors that the effectiveness of boot camps could rest on the quality of aftercare provided to offenders after release. Despite this, boot camps continue to grow in number as they are viewed as a viable alternative to traditional imprisonment. Hayeslip (1994) contends that boot camps will continue to grow in number considering that correctional officials, judges, offenders, and politicians -- both conservative and liberal -- endorse the use of boot camp programs. However, Hayeslip cautions that the future of boot camps lies within their ability to provide effective and quality aftercare provisions to probationers. In addition, President Clinton's Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, provides \$2 billion for creating more boot camps.

### **Discussion Questions**

1. What do the critics of boot camps say about the CRIPP program?
2. Explain CRIPP and its major components?
3. What did the CRIPP study find concerning recidivism?
4. How does one really determine if a boot camp program is working as an intermediate sanction?
5. What kind of impact will the President's Crime Bill have on the future of boot camps?

### **Key Terms**

Battle Dress Uniform (BDU)  
chain of command  
cohort  
discipline

group counseling  
Harris County Sheriff Department  
individual counseling  
law and order  
life skills training  
marching  
physical training  
Sentencing Alternative Intensive Program (SAIP)  
substance abuse treatment  
Texas Department of Criminal Justice - Institutional Division  
work

### REFERENCES

- Anderson, J. F. (1995). A tracking investigation on participants of the Harris County, Texas Courts Regimented Intensive Probation Program. Unpublished dissertation, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas.
- Anderson, J. F. and Dyson, L. (1996). A tracking investigation to determine boot camp success and offender risk assessment for CRIPP participants. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 19(1): 179-190.
- Anderson, J. F., Carson, G., Dyson, L. (1995). Drug use history and shock incarceration outcome. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 11(3): 196-200.
- Bourque, B., Han, M. and Hill, M. (1996). A national survey of aftercare provisions for bootcamp graduates. National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, Research in Brief, May.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (1984). *Prisoners in 1983*. Washington, D. C. : U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Burns, J. (1990). A survey of state correctional boot camp program. Paper presented at the annual meeting (February 1990) of Southern Conference of Corrections, Florida State University, Tallahassee.
- Burns, J. and Vito, G. (1995). An impact analysis of the Alabama boot camp program. *Federal Probation*, March, 63-67.

- Gottfredson, M. and Hirschi, T. (1990). A general theory of crime. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hayeslip, D. W. (1994). Correctional boot camps: Promise and pitfall. A paper presented at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences.
- Hunter, R. J. (1993). Shock incarceration: An impact assessment measuring attitudinal changes in the Harris County, Texas courts regimented intensive probation program. Unpublished dissertation, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas.
- MacKenzie, D. L. (1990). Boot camp prisons: Components, evaluations, and empirical issues. *Federal Probation*, (September) 44-52.
- MacKenzie, D. L. and Souryal, C. (1995). Inmates Attitude change during incarceration: A comparison of boot camp with traditional prison. *Justice Quarterly*. 12(2): 325-354.
- Morash, M. and Rucker, L. (1990). A critical look at the ideal of boot camp as correctional reform. *Crime and Delinquency*, 36, 204-22.
- Morris, N. and Tonry, M. (1990). Between prison and probation: Intermediate punishment in a rational sentencing system. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Parent, D. (1989). Shock incarceration: An overview of existing program. National Institute of Justice: Issues and Practices. June.
- Public Law 103-322 (1994). Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. Washington, DC: US. Government Printing Officer. (September).
- Ribner, S. A. and Steadman, H. J. (1981). Recidivism among offenders and ex-mental patients. *Criminology*, 19(3), 411-420.
- Samaha, J. (1994). Criminal justice. New York: West Publishing.



Sampson, R.J. and Laub, J. H. (1990). Crime and deviance over the life course: The salience of adult social bonds. *American Sociological Review*, 55, 609-627.

Texas legislature considered more prisons and alternatives. *Criminal Justice Newsletter*, 22 (1 August 1991), 4.

Wallerstedt, J. F. (1984). *Returning to Prison*. Washington, D. C. : Bureau of Justice Statistics, 5.

Wilson, J.Q. and Herrnstein, R. J. (1985). *Crime and human nature: The definitive study of the causes of crime*. New York: Simon and Schuster Publishers.

## **CHAPTER 7**

---

### **A Tracking Investigation to Determine Boot Camp Success And Offender Risk Assessment For CRIPP Participants**

Since the history of corrections has always been replete with various approaches and strategies due to changing social, political, and economic conditions, the 1980s would not prove to be an exception. For example, this decade produced the development and creation of boot camp programs and other alternative strategies to reduce prison overcrowding, as well as serve other correctional purposes, such as deterrence, punishment, rehabilitation, and the reduction of expensive prison costs. Moreover, MacKenzie (1990) and Parent (1989) contend that the popularity of boot camp programs reached a plateau in the late 1980s. Despite this, they would continue to increase into the 1990s.

As stated in Chapter Six, Texas created CRIPP for several reasons that generally included: (1) To decrease inmate overcrowding; (2) to reduce needed bed space for hardened criminals; and (3) to alleviate the need to build more prisons. Despite these compelling reasons, Texas is unquestionably concerned with reducing high levels of recidivism. Therefore, CRIPP's primary concern is to change offenders and discourage them from a life of crime. As such, it is important that Texas correctional officials, state legislators, and judges are knowledgeable of the effectiveness of the CRIPP program. Unfortunately, many offenders are arbitrarily given this sentencing option. There are no existing data that indicate which type of offenders fare better after being sentenced to boot camp. Since the early 1980s, judges around the country have been sentencing offenders to boot camp without full knowledge of how

offenders adjust to post-release. Therefore, this chapter focuses on the types of offenders sentenced to boot camp and which are at a greater risk of recidivating after release. The chief benefit of this chapter is that the findings could assist Texas with its boot camps and other states that are considering their implementation. This chapter reveals which type of offenders would be better served by receiving a sentence to prison rather than boot camp. A failure to heed the lessons learned from the Texas CRIPP could mean that other state correctional systems will experience the misfortune of adding more economic strain to already deficient state corrections' budgets.

## **RECIDIVISM AND OFFENDER RISK ASSESSMENT**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **Subjects**

This study was conducted with 1,225 (all male) boot camp graduates released at the end of 1994 to determine CRIPP's effectiveness. The data for this study was collected over a two year period. To accomplish the task of determining levels of recidivism, criminal records were analyzed to assess CRIPP participants' reinvolvement in crime after release from the boot camp facility. The sample for this analysis was chosen based on the number of participants who had graduated from CRIPP at the time of the study.

The sample had like characteristics in terms of age; gender; education; socioeconomic status; and criminality. Given that the sample had resided in the community for over one year after release, this group had been exposed to the risks that follow being released and placed in the offenders' regular environment. Therefore, the utility of the sentence type (i.e. boot camp) should be revealed through tracking. That is, this study will suggest if the boot camp sentence lessened rearrest after release to the community. JIMS was used to determine if CRIPP offenders had reoffended and re-entered the Texas Department of Criminal Justice - Institutional Division.

### **FINDINGS**

This chapter examined a group of boot camp graduates to determine levels of recidivism and offender risk assessment. We assessed recidivism

of CRIPP graduates who had been released into the free community for nearly two years. Table 7.1 shows the percentage of recidivism outcome of CRIPP participants. The research reveals that the boot camp participants had a level of recidivism at 22%.

The most common measure of program effectiveness in correctional research has been offender recidivism, especially boot camps (Parent, 1989; MacKenzie, 1990). Ideally, when recidivism is reduced, it is assumed that the program has effectively reformed offenders. Researchers also maintain that effective programs save taxpayers revenues when successful.

In this study, CRIPP's success was based on the extent the program reduced levels of recidivism. The CRIPP participants fared well in regards to rearrests. CRIPP recidivism rate was 22%. This compares favorably to regular probationers and parolees in Texas with reported recidivism rates of 28.53% and 28.6%, respectively (Criminal Justice Policy Council, 1994). Therefore, this alternative to incarceration proved effective and beneficial to participants in the short term. Because offenders are reformed as revealed by reduced or lower levels of criminal behavior, researchers, such as MacKenzie (1991), Sykes (1958), and Mathiesen (1990), have argued that the prison experience enhances the offenders' negative sentiments and makes them hardened through associations with other prisoners who sometimes reinforce and encourage antisocial behavior that prevent healthy post-release adjustment. Others contend that the sentence of imprisonment negates any kind of rehabilitative potential given to the offender even if he or she is given self-help programs while serving traditional incarceration.

Table 7.1 Levels of Recidivism Over a One Year Period

Probation	Parole	Boot Camp CRIPP
28.53*	28.6*	22.0

\* estimate is based on data collected by the Justice Information Management System (JIMS)

Additionally, we used a logistic regression model to determine which participants were more likely to reoffend after boot camp. Logistic regression was used to classify participants in the CRIPP program. Statisticians such as Hair, Anderson, Tatham, and Black (1992) claim that logistic regression is an appropriate technique to apply when the research questions involve dichotomous dependent variables and several independent variables. Basically, they contend that logistic regression should be used when a set of independent variables are classifying an outcome variable. Applying logistic regression to model the hazard rates across multiple attributes, such as before felony; offense type - drug; offense type - personal; before misdemeanor; and age will enable one to determine which variables were associated with different patterns of failure as identified by recidivism. From this approach, one should be able to assess whether there is a difference in failure rates of boot camp participants relative to other correctional programs. From these findings, one can classify variables associated with recidivism. The findings from the analysis are found in Tables 7.2 and Table 7.3.

Table 7.2 Coefficient Logistic s For Regression of CRIPP Failures

Independent Variables	Model 1
Constant	-3.3861*
Before Felony (0=no 1=yes)	1.2213 (.4741)
Offense Type-Drug (0=no 1=yes)	.6945 (.2286)
Offense Type-Personal (0=no 1=yes)	.6109 (.2543)
Before Misdemeanor (0=no 1=yes)	.6865 (.1975)
New-Age (17,18,19=1 else=0)	.6447 (.2128)

\*p<.05 The number in parentheses are standard errors. This model correctly classifies 78% of those CRIPP failures

Table 7.2 presents independent variables as predictors of reinvolvement in crime. The table lists five variables: (1) before felony; (2) offense type - drug; offense type - personal; (4) before misdemeanor, and (5) new - age. The findings from Table 7.2 reveal how the

independent variables were recoded for the logistic regression model. Also, the table provides the logistic regression coefficients for the regression of CRIPP failure. The findings in Table 7.2 are significant because judges in Harris County, Texas, like others around the country, impose the sentence to CRIPP in an arbitrary manner. There are no existing guidelines for judges to follow when imposing this intermediate sentence. The findings from the regression model shed light on which offenders do worse after CRIPP. This could assist judges in Texas and other states on those suitable and unsuitable for this intermediate sanction. Table 7.2 demonstrates that offenders with (1) prior felony convictions; (2) prior drug offenses; (3) prior personal offenses; (4) prior misdemeanors, and (5) who are between the ages of 17 to 20 are more likely to fail after boot camp than offenders sentenced to CRIPP without these extra legal variables.

The findings from Table 7.3 use the five independent variables to predict the dependent variable (fail or no fail). The dependent variable *fail* means reconviction and recidivated. Table 7.3 reveals that the effects of a prior felony conviction are positive and significant at the .05 level on the dependent variable (fail, no fail). Thus, having a prior felony conviction increases the probability of failure by almost 27%. The effects of a conviction for a prior drug use offense are positive and significant at the .05 level on the dependent variable (fail, no fail). Thus, having a prior drug offense increases the probability of failure by almost 14%.

A conviction of a prior personal offense is positive and significant at .05 level on the dependent variable (fail, no fail). Thus, a prior personal offense increases the probability of failure by almost 14%. This table indicates that those with prior offenses perhaps stand a greater chance of reoffending than those who do not have a history of prior offenses.

A prior misdemeanor conviction is positive and significant at .05 on the dependent variable (fail, no fail). Therefore, a prior misdemeanor conviction increases the probability of failure by 13%. One's age is positive and significant at .05 on the dependent variable (fail, no fail). Therefore, age increases the probability of failure by almost 12%.

While examining CRIPP failures by each month participants have been out on probation, one significant finding emerges. This research indicates that 51%, or 74 of the 145 failures, occurred after the first six months of release; thus, indicating that many participants have a very difficult time with post-release readjustment. The research further demonstrates that as the months progress, CRIPP participants tend to

recidivate at a lesser rate. For example, after the first twelve months, levels of failure quickly dissipate, which indicates that failure could be at its lowest point after the first year of release. Penal critics charge that several reasons exist that could explain this failure rate. They argue that these are found within the structure of Super Intensive Probation Programs (SIPP) and aftercare programs that are provided. First, SIPP programs require adherence to rigorous conditions of release to which many offenders have a difficult time complying. The conditions include such requirements as maintaining a job; random drug tests; weekly visits to parole officers; seeking alcohol and drug treatment; and individual counseling and therapy sessions. The failure of participants to meet these requirements could mean revocation and invariably recidivism. Second, another factor that contributes to boot camp failure is a lack of aftercare programs or quality aftercare programs designed to meet the special needs of offenders.

## DISCUSSION

It is hoped that judicial officials will recognize and accept these findings and sentence offenders to boot camps in a manner that is consistent with these research conclusions. Similarly, other states considering boot camps can save valuable economic resources and time without having to learn of this finding long after investing millions of dollars. The finding in this investigation is consistent with findings by other researchers such as MacKenzie, Shaw, and Souryal (1992).

Because of its success, CRIPP and other boot camp programs should be viewed as viable alternatives to traditional imprisonment. Hayeslip (1994) contends that boot camps will continue to grow in number considering correctional officials, judges, offenders, and politicians (both conservative and liberal) who endorse the use of boot camp programs. In addition, President Clinton's crime prevention bill that passed in Congress in 1994 provides \$2 billion dollars for creating more boot camps.

One concern that this investigation presents that should be of interest to judicial officials and boot camp supervisors is that those with a prior felony are more at risk of reoffending than other participants. The variable *before felony* was the strongest indicator of an offender's probability of risk. Therefore, perhaps those with a criminal history are not the best candidates for shock incarceration. Moreover, those with criminal histories could strain an already weakened criminal justice

system and economy by experiencing boot camp and later reoffending and receiving a traditional sentence. However, the use of boot camps provide positive benefits. For instance, they save the state money by not having to erect new prisons; they increase the number of prison beds needed for serious criminals; and they reduce prison overcrowding (MacKenzie, 1993; Parent, 1989). As stated earlier, boot camp failure typically occurs shortly after release. Some scholars attribute this to the strict and rigid conditions of probation. As stated earlier, boot camp failure typically occurs shortly after release. Some scholars attribute this to the strict and rigid conditions of probation found in SIPP. However, others maintain that aftercare programs or a lack of quality aftercare programs could invariably determine if boot camp programs and other intermediate sanctions are successful.

To date, over 3,000 offenders have graduated from the Harris County, Texas CRIPP boot camp program. This initial recidivism study of 1,225 participants reveals its chief impact: A sentence to CRIPP reduces future offending behaviors after release that dissipates over time. This could be corrected with quality aftercare programs. Future research of CRIPP must continue to track these offenders' positive adjustment in the community in later adult life. To date, the findings are somewhat encouraging in that CRIPP is a viable intermediate sanction for Harris County, Texas, and potentially for other local jurisdictions considering the implementation of similar programs.





### **Discussion Questions**

1. Which type of offenders would be better served by receiving a traditional prison sentence versus boot camp? Why?
2. Explain the methodology used in recidivism and offender risk assessment?
3. What success was achieved by CRIPP and what variables are important to failure?
4. Discuss what the findings from the CRIPP program's could mean for other boot camps.
5. What effect does having a prior felony mean for potential boot camp participants?

### **Key Terms**

extra legal variables  
fail  
no fail

offender risk assessment  
prior offenses  
self-help programs

### **REFERENCES**

- Hair, J., Anderson, R., Tatham, R., and Black, W. (1992). *Multivariate Data Analysis With Readings*. New York: Macmillian Publishing Company.
- Hayeslip, D. W. (1994). "Correctional boot camps: Promise and pitfall." A paper presented at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences.
- MacKenzie, D. (1990). "Boot camp prisons: components, evaluations, and empirical issues." *Federal Probation*, (September) 44-52.
- MacKenzie, D. (1991). "Boot camp programs grow in number and scope." *NIJ Reports*. US Department of Justice (November/December) 221.
- MacKenzie, D. (1993). "Boot camp prisons in 1993". *National Institute of Justice Journal*. (Washington: National Institute of Justice), 21-28.

- MacKenzie, D., Shaw, J., and 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): 437-454.
- Mathiesen, T. (1990). *Prison on Trial*. London: Sage Publication.
- Parent, D. (1989). *Shock incarceration: An overview of existing program*. National Institute of Justice: Issues and Practices. June.
- Recidivism in the Texas criminal justice system: Sentencing dynamics study, Report 5 (1994). Criminal Justice Policy Council. Austin, Texas.
- Sykes, G. (1958). *The society of captives: A study of a maximum security prison*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

## **CHAPTER 8**

---

### **Effective Aftercare Provisions Could Hold the Key to the Rehabilitative Effects of Shock Incarceration Programs**

While faced with increasing crime rates and prison overcrowding, many state correctional systems are seeking alternatives to incarceration (Anderson, Carson, and Dyson, 1996). Diversions are sought after in the American penal system because the cost of incarcerating offenders has skyrocketed causing a strain on many state correctional budgets. For example, Eskridge (1996) estimates that states pay more than \$25,000 annually to confine an offender in prison. Therefore, as an attempt to reduce exuberant budgets and accommodate huge numbers of offenders entering the system, correctional agencies have begun exploring alternatives, such as house arrest; electronic monitoring; intensive probation supervision; boot camps; and other community-based programs. These alternatives have become popular in recent years because of their economic potential to be cost-effective and their commitment to punishing offenders.

Diversions are sought after to punish offenders and to deter potential law violators. However, boot camps, more so than many other intermediate sanctions, appear to hold the promise of being a viable alternative since they have the potential to reform criminals by punishing them with physical pain while simultaneously providing them an opportunity to become law-abiding. This twin effect satisfies both liberals and conservatives since it offers treatment and punishment. Because the boot camp literature is replete with studies on recidivism, this chapter addresses a neglected area of shock incarceration -- the effect of aftercare

provisions offered to graduates. Since it is believed that a lack of aftercare provisions contribute to recidivism, this chapter explores this crucial, yet often ignored area.

## SHOCK INCARCERATION

The first boot camp, or shock incarceration program, used as a form of correctional treatment appeared in Georgia in 1983 (Parent, 1989). Since then, however, boot camps have increased in number and continue to enjoy widespread popularity in appeal and usage. Bourque, Han, and Hill (1996) contend that 52 boot camp programs exist in the United States and thirty of them opened after 1991. Because of the surge of boot camps in recent times, one has to ask what are boot camps, and what is it about them that makes them attractive to correctional officials and the public? Boot camps are defined as viable alternatives to traditional incarceration to which offenders are sentenced for a brief period of time as a form of punishment (Parent, 1989). Boot camps today, unlike in the past, make accommodations for juveniles and women and are operated by state, local, juvenile, and Federal agencies (Bourque et al., 1996; Austin, Jones, and Bolyard, 1993). Though they were originally created for young, first-time offenders who commit nonviolent criminal activities, this is not always the case since the age and offense of participants vary (see Burns and Vito, 1995; Anderson, 1990).

The boot camp experience is an attempt to reshape offenders by removing excuses they use for violating the law (Burns, Anderson, and Dyson, 1997). More specifically, shock incarceration programs strive to instill self-respect; discipline; a work ethic; and responsibility in offenders for their actions, as well as teach them respect for the law and fellow citizens (Parent, 1989; Burns, 1990; Anderson, 1990). Some scholars argue boot camps provide offenders a second chance to be law-abiding without subjecting them to the harsh realities of prison life (Burns, 1990; Parent, 1989; Anderson and Dyson, 1996). Therefore, they contend that shock incarceration programs are offered to offenders that are viewed as salvageable and deserving of a second chance.

A sentence to boot camp essentially means that offenders have been given a reprieve from traditional confinement (see Sykes, 1958). They must, therefore, spend 90 days or more (each state specifies its own time period) in a quasi-military environment that emphasizes intense discipline; physical training; marching; hard labor; and individual and group counseling. These components are designed to provide them with

the necessary skills needed to function as law-abiding citizens when released (Parent, 1989; MacKenzie, 1990). However, if participants fail to satisfy all phases of the shock incarceration experience, they could be recycled or dismissed from the program and made to serve a regular sentence.

Though it may appear that a sentence to boot camp is given for humanitarian reasons, correctional experts warn this is far from reality. For example, a sentence to boot camp is usually imposed on offenders when states (1) have limited bed space for hardened criminals; (2) lack the financial resources to build more prisons or add additional space; (3) suffer prison overcrowding; or (4) when officials respond to public outcry over an increasing crime problem (Hunter, 1993; Burns and Vito, 1995; Burns, 1990; Parent, 1989; MacKenzie, 1990).

Since a disproportionate number of boot camp participants come from socially disorganized neighborhoods characterized by poverty; drugs; crime; firearms; gangs; and lawlessness, the shock incarceration experience could provide the discipline and self-control that is commonly lacking in these socially-challenged areas. Therefore, boot camps operate under the guise that by emphasizing respect for self, authority, and others, offenders are provided an alternative means of diffusing potentially violent situations. They are taught to invoke verbal dispute resolutions rather than resort to physical violence (Anderson and Dyson, 1996).

One of the biggest criticisms targeted at shock incarceration programs is that after offenders complete their sentence, they are returned to the same dysfunctional communities where they were arrested and are expected to avoid the same criminogenic factors that they were unable to avoid before being sentenced to boot camp. Critics contend that this approach is unrealistic unless probationers are provided adequate supervision; counseling; monitoring; meaningful job skills; and are afforded the opportunity to participate in the labor force upon release. If they are not provided the opportunity to work, higher rates of recidivism could be an inevitable outcome. Therefore, critics argue that employment and proper aftercare provisions could prevent offenders from continuing in a life of crime.

### **SHOCK INCARCERATION AND AFTERCARE PROVISIONS**

After some participants graduate from boot camp, they are placed in intensive supervision programs that provide them with rules and regulations that they must follow as conditions of probation. An offender's placement in such a program is based on the availability of programs. Bourque et al., (1996) in a study of existing aftercare programs found that of the 52 boot camps surveyed, only 18 programs indicated that they have aftercare provisions that specifically target boot camp populations. As a result, participants from states lacking aftercare provisions are returned to the communities from where they came and are not provided assistance or supervision. Unfortunately, for a majority of boot camp participants, their boot camp experience ends here. Critics argue that this is why some boot camps fail to reduce recidivism. In contrast, offenders who are provided aftercare provisions face rigorous programs that assist them in making a successful return to their respective communities (Bourque et al., 1996).

Aftercare programs are designed to facilitate behavioral, social, and attitudinal changes that boot camps have instilled in participants. Some contend that for aftercare services to have a positive effect, those in corrections and the community must follow consistent treatment philosophies. One workable strategy upon which communities rely to provide quality aftercare is offering individualized case planning to offenders from the point of their commitment until they are released from supervision (Bourque et al., 1996; Altschuler and Armstrong, 1994). Community efforts, therefore, monitor what is actually learned from boot camp and provide intensive surveillance to ensure that offenders comply with the conditions of release. Another salient area of aftercare that institutions can explore to ensure that probationers have a successful readjustment to society includes drawing on all available community resources. These include, but are not limited to, counseling services, substance abuse treatment, vocational training, and acquiring assistance with locating a job for probationers. The quality of provisions offered by communities often vary depending on the amount of resources allocated for aftercare services (Bourque et al., 1996).

Most aftercare services require that offenders are first placed on intensive supervision programs and gradually move toward regular supervision where they remain until their sentence is served. In these programs, offenders must comply with regulations that are established by

aftercare providers or face revocation. Program requirements could vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction (see Table 8.1). Some common regulations require offenders to attend Alcoholic Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous; observe curfews; submit to random urine tests; engage in unpaid community work; and meet with a parole officer several times weekly (Bourque et al., 1996).

Researchers (Bourque et al., 1996) contend that the most rigorous requirements that releasees face include spending time on work furloughs and other transitional facilities. For example, offenders are released to community correctional centers located near their place of residence. At these centers, probationers have contact with releasees from various penal institutions. Aftercare services typically have three phases. In Phase One, releasees are only permitted to leave the center for employment purposes or to attend programs sponsored by aftercare services. Phase Two is referred to as the pre-release stage. Releasees with this status are permitted to leave the center, but must return at night. In the final stage, offenders are released and required to undergo intensive home confinement that includes electronic monitoring (Bourque et al., 1996).

Though aftercare provisions exert a tremendous amount of control over offenders, they are instrumental in making probationers and parolees aware of their status as offenders. Aftercare provisions offer surveillance and monitoring services designed to foster the offender's reintegration to the community (Bourque et al., 1996). These services address criticisms made about shock incarceration programs, i.e., that after boot camp, participants are returned to the same criminogenic environments and abandoned. Those charged with the responsibility of providing aftercare services maintain that upon release, offenders are closely monitored and supervised so that they will not recidivate. Advocates argue that by closely monitoring and subjecting offenders to random drug testing and a rigid structure, they become aware that officials are watching and reporting their behavior. Therefore, the potential for sudden detection and revocation is enough to prevent some offenders from engaging in behaviors that violate conditions of their release.

Determining the effectiveness of aftercare programs requires constant monitoring and evaluating (Bourque et al., 1996). In their study, Bourque and colleagues (1996) discovered that after probationers are released from shock incarceration to aftercare services, the responsibility of monitoring them shifts from correctional institutions to the



departments of parole and probation. Unfortunately, there is little or no communication between these agencies. For example, Bourque and colleagues contend that if any feedback is made on the status of boot camp graduates, it is often a notification that offenders have violated conditions of release or that they have committed new crimes.

A notification that graduates have recidivated or violated conditions of probation is not enough information for boot camp officials to determine the weaknesses or flaws in their programs so as to adjust them accordingly to prevent other graduates from continuing in crime after release. In the final analysis, the Bourque and colleagues investigation showed that programs with aftercare provisions reported recidivism levels that ranged from 10 to 35 percent. This finding was favorable since the level of recidivism for boot camp participants was lower than the comparison group of prisoners. However, they caution that without knowing the differences in the two groups, this finding becomes optimistically questionable.

Though aftercare provisions hold tremendous promise, they are not without problems. For example, many provisions overwhelmingly place post-release responsibilities on agencies outside the realms of correctional institutions (Bourque et al., 1996). Some contend this exploits the resources of agencies not affiliated with corrections. Another problem is geography, whereby small numbers of offenders are released in widely dispersed areas that make grouping boot camp graduates impossible. Spatial problems complicate the process of providing adequate and effective aftercare services. Yet, another problem is that aftercare programs place too much emphasis on intensive surveillance and too little on providing offenders intensive services (Bourque et al., 1996; Altschuler and Armstrong, 1994). Despite these shortcomings, the problems found in aftercare provisions can be alleviated to make them effective.

### **THE NEED TO CREATE EFFECTIVE AFTERCARE PROVISIONS**

Research on aftercare provisions indicate that offenders who are provided these services recidivate less often than offenders who are not (Bourque et al., 1996; Austin et al., 1993). Studies on boot camps in Maryland, Arizona, New Hampshire, and Illinois with aftercare provisions support this contention. For example, recidivism levels of Baltimore boot camp graduates were lower (19.6%) than those among

other Maryland shock incarceration programs. Similarly, Arizona reports that its shock incarceration return rate of 12 percent compares favorably to a prison recidivism rate of 32 percent. Likewise, New Hampshire found that after two years, boot camp graduates' recidivism levels were a low 17 percent compared to a group of prisoners with a level at 47 percent (Bourque et al., 1996). Further, Illinois reports that after three years, boot camp graduates had a recidivism rate of 21 percent while comparison groups averaged a rate of 34 percent (Illinois Department of Corrections, 1992). Perhaps aftercare provisions make the difference between success or failure after release.

If boot camp programs fail to provide aftercare services to probationers, they could undermine the rehabilitative efforts made by participants, as well as boot camp officials. Without closely monitoring the behavior of released offenders, there is no tangible way of measuring the benefits of shock incarceration programs. Indicators of rearrest alone are not enough to determine the value of this alternative to incarceration. Thus, aftercare services are in place to reinforce what participants were taught at boot camp. Furthermore, shock incarceration programs that lack post-release provisions could impede the long-term effects of the boot camp experience. Moreover, since boot camps were partially created to alleviate expensive correctional costs, they could have the unintended effect of doing more harm than good to already strained correctional budgets if they fail to prevent participants from reoffending. As a result, taxpayers would have the added burden of defraying the costs of failed boot camp programs and a regular sentence to prison.

Aftercare services can be effective if correctional personnel are aware that they are an integral part of the shock incarceration process. Austin et al., (1993) argue that aftercare provisions can have a positive effect on reinforcing the benefits of boot camp if intensive supervision and services are continued after the offenders are released. Therefore, correctional officials can show their commitment to providing adequate aftercare services by cultivating relationships with community residents, social service agencies, and others in the departments of probation and parole. Those associated with shock incarceration can seize the opportunity to work with those in community-based correctional centers. The overall effectiveness of aftercare provisions depends on consistent communication between agencies involved in the process (Bourque et al., 1996). Effective communication would provide boot camp officials with the feedback they need to identify problem areas in their programs so that

modifications can be made to prevent offenders from continuing a life of crime.

### **THE FUTURE OF SHOCK INCARCERATION PROGRAMS**

The proliferation of boot camps is surprising since many formal evaluations have not been conducted to determine their effectiveness (Hayeslip, 1994; MacKenzie, Shaw, and Gowdy, 1993). Despite this, boot camps continue to grow in number. Furthermore, since the passage of President Clinton's Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, which allowed \$2 billion to create more boot camps, they could be a part of correctional practices for years to come. Moreover, boot camps are popular and continue to grow because of three reasons: (1) They are cost-effective; (2) they help preserve scarce bed space; and (3) they are therapeutic in their corrections approach. First, boot camps are viewed as cost-effective alternatives that save states millions each year. By placing offenders in boot camps, states are relieved of having to build more prisons to accommodate large numbers of incoming prisoners (Yurkanin, 1988). For example, New York corrections officials estimate that boot camps have saved the public over \$90 million by not having to build new corrections facilities and \$80 million in operation costs because participants do not have long tenures (Criminal Justice Newsletter, 1991).

Second, shock incarceration programs continue to grow because they reduce jail and prison overcrowding by allowing scarce bed space for hardened criminals. The Bureau of Justice Statistics (1992) reported that overcrowding in American jails and prisons has reached the point of crisis leaving many under state and federal court orders to reduce the number of inmates in each cell. BJS also indicated that on any given day, more than 427,000 inmates are housed in jails, and 1.3 million inmates are confined in the nation's prisons each year. As a result, many nonviolent offenders are sentenced to intermediate sanctions, including shock incarceration, as a means of reducing overcrowding. Austin et al., (1993) found that boot camps are not only used by correctional systems, but rather, jails began using them as early as 1986. Further, they report that many jails are either using or considering boot camps to reduce overcrowding. Until the inmate population dissipates, boot camps could be used more often on the city, state, and federal levels.

Third, boot camps continue to grow because they use therapeutic methods to punish offenders. Shock incarceration programs offer offenders individual and group counseling to constructively cope with internal and external conflict. Further, they provide vocational, as well as educational, training programs that allow offenders the opportunity to earn a General Equivalency Diploma and acquire technical training. This aspect of boot camp enables offenders to be employable when they exit these programs. They offer substance abuse treatment programs that help many offenders overcome chemical dependency. These treatment components along with physical training; marching; strict discipline; respect; and a hard work ethic are designed to reform participants. This approach to treating offenders compares favorably to sentencing offenders to traditional confinement and hoping that they learn from that experience. The history of correctional treatment teaches otherwise. In contrast, shock incarceration attempts to provide offenders with social and marketable skills that are necessary to prevent them from becoming reinvolved in crime.

## DISCUSSION

Shock incarceration programs hold the potential to reduce prison overcrowding; provide therapy; reduce recidivism; and remain cost-effective. However, these goals could be compromised if aftercare provisions are not provided to boot camp graduates. Therefore, other programs around the country would do well to pattern their programs after those found in Maryland, Arizona, New Hampshire, and Illinois. Without aftercare provisions, boot camps, like other diversions, might have the unintended effect of being more harmful than good by becoming yet another failed alternative in the corrections arsenal. Moreover, the financial burden of dealing with groups of failed boot camp graduates would add to already strained state correctional budgets. Therefore, unless aftercare provisions are made an integral part of shock incarceration, any rehabilitative effects could be lost.

**Discussion Questions**

1. Explain why aftercare is an essential part of boot camp participants' successful reintegration.
2. What appears to be the real reason or rationale behind the boot camp sanction?
3. What are aftercare provisions designed to accomplish regarding boot camps?
4. What are the problems associated with aftercare and what provisions can be used to make them effective?
5. Why can't boot camps be an effective intermediate sanction without aftercare provisions?

**Key Terms**

aftercare	dysfunctional communities
aftercare programs	Phase One of Aftercare
aftercare services	Phase Two of Aftercare
American penal system	Phase Three of Aftercare
community resources	random drug testing
criminogenic factors	readjustment
	revocation

**REFERENCES**

- Altschuler, D. M. and Armstrong, T. L. (1994). Intensive aftercare for high-risk juveniles: A community care model. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Anderson, J. F. (1990). "An exploratory investigation to determine boot camp successes and failures." Unpublished Thesis. Alabama State University. Montgomery, Alabama.
- Anderson, J. F. and Dyson, L. (1996). "A tracking investigation to determine boot camp success and offender risk assessment for CRIPP participants." *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 19(1): 179-190.

- Anderson, J. F., Carson, G. and Dyson, L. (1996). "Drug use history and shock incarceration outcome." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 11(3): 196-200.
- Austin, J., Jones, M. and Bolyard, M. (1993). The growing use of jail boot camps: The current state of the art. National Institute of Justice, October.
- Bourque, B. B., Han, M. and Hill, S. M. (1996). A national survey of aftercare provisions for boot camp graduates. National Institute of Justice, May.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (1992). Jail inmates 1991. Washington, D.C. June.
- Burns, J. (1990). "A survey of state correctional boot camp programs." Paper presented at the annual meeting (Southern Conference of Corrections) Florida State University, February.
- Burns, J., Anderson, J. F. and Dyson, L. (1997). "What DRU participants are saying about shock incarceration: The Alabama experience." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*. 13(2):172-183.
- Burns, J. and Vito, G. (1995). "An impact analysis of the Alabama boot camp program." *Federal Probation*, 63-67: March.
- Eskridge, C. W. (1996). *Criminal justice: Concepts and issues*. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Hayeslip, D. W. (1994). "Correctional boot camps: Promise and pitfall." A paper presented at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences.
- Hunter, R. J. (1993). *Shock incarceration: An impact assessment measuring attitudinal changes in the Harris County Texas Courts Regimented Probation Program*. Unpublished Dissertation, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas.

- Illinois Department of Corrections. (1992). *Impact Incarceration Program: 1992 Annual Report to the Governor and the General Assembly*. Springfield: Illinois Department of Corrections.
- MacKenzie, D. L. (1990). "Boot camp prisons: Components, evaluations, and empirical issues." *Federal Probation*. 44-55, September.
- MacKenzie, D. L., Shaw, J. W. and Gowdy, V. B. (1993). "An evaluation of shock incarceration in Louisiana." *National Institute of Justice*, June.
- Parent, D. (1989). *Shock incarceration: An overview of existing programs*. National Institute of Justice: Issues and Practices. June
- Public Law 103-322 (1994). *Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, (September).
- Sykes, G. (1958). *The society of captives: A study of a maximum security prison*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- "Texas legislature considered more prisons and alternatives." *Criminal Justice Newsletter*, 22 (1 August 1991): 4.
- Yurkanin, A. (1988). "Trend toward shock incarceration increasing among states." *Corrections Today*. June.

Table 8.1 *Special Boot Camp Aftercare Programs and Requirements*

	Federal/State Programs	Local Programs	Juvenile Programs	TOTALS
No special requirements or programming for boot camp graduates specified	AL, AR, CO FL, GA ID, MS, NV, NC, OK-SIP SC, TX, WI, WY	CA-Santa MI-Pontiac TX-Brazos County	CO-Golden Clara	
	14	3	1	18
Aftercare regimen specified but no separate program for boot camp graduates	CA, GA-P IL, KS, KY LA, MA, MT OK-RID, OR PA, TN, VA FEDERAL	NY-Nassau NY-Riker's Island	GA-LEAD FL-Manatee FL-Martin FL-Pinellas FL-Leon	
	14	2	5	21
Aftercare program designed and operated exclusively for boot camp graduates	AZ-Maricopa County MD-Baltimore  MI Coun ty MN-St. Paul NH NY-New York City OH	TX-Travis TX-Hidalgo TX-Harris County	AL-Mobile  OH-Cuyahoga  NY-South Kortwright	
	7	3	3	13

\*Table taken from A National Survey of Aftercare Provisions for Boot Camp Graduates by National Institute of Justice (May, 1996)





## CHAPTER 9

---

### Conclusion

There is little doubt that the American correctional system has reached the point of crisis. This is indicated by both the growing number of inmates entering the system and by the short periods of confinement given to some of them to accommodate the increasing numbers who are jailed and imprisoned on the local, state, and federal levels. However, the point of crisis is probably best illustrated by the number of offenders diverted from traditional imprisonment because of the escalating costs that are associated with confinement. Diversions are sought after because they help alleviate over-burdened state budgets. For example, it is estimated that the average state pays \$100,000 for construction per cell and an additional \$20,000 yearly to house each inmate. Because of this expensive cost, some argue it is more likely that diversions and other alternatives to incarceration will be rigorously sought after in the future. One diversion which holds promise is boot camp. Shock incarceration is a viable alternative to traditional incarceration that seeks to reduce strained prison budgets; overcrowding; reduced bed space for hardened criminals; and offer participants a chance to be rehabilitated men and women who are law-abiding and better equipped to play adult social roles in the broader society.

Part of this book examined three offender groups to determine levels of recidivism. We compared recidivism among CRIPP graduates against regular probationers and parolees who had been released to the community for similar periods of time. This examination specifically compared reconvictions of these groups to determine recidivism. The research revealed that after being released into the free community for nearly two years, the boot camp group had the lowest level of recidivism at 22%, followed by probationers 28.53%, and parolees 28.6%, respectively. On the surface, this shows that CRIPP has salient components associated with its experience that enables CRIPP

participants to avoid reconvictions that are not present in the other comparison groups. Some researchers argue that the prison experience enhances the offenders' negative sentiments and makes them hardened through associations with other prisoners. Others contend that the sentence of imprisonment negates any kind of rehabilitative potential given to offenders, even if they are provided self-help programs while serving traditional incarceration. The importance of this finding is that exposure to imprisonment could have negative effects that are carried into the free community upon the offenders' release. Here the CRIPP recidivism rates are lower than the comparisons.

Correctional and penal experts agree that the most common measure of program effectiveness (especially boot camp) in correctional research is offender recidivism. Correctional authorities postulate that if recidivism levels are not lowered or reduced over a reasonable period of time after the implementation of a program, then the program is a failure and is viewed as an additional burden to taxpayers. Ideally, when recidivism is reduced, it is assumed that the program has effectively reformed offenders, and therefore the state or correctional institution will not continue defraying the costs of additional correctional treatment for those offenders. Therefore, researchers also maintain that effective programs invariably save taxpayers revenues.

CRIPP, like other boot camps, instills in participants positive attitudinal changes and teach them that they are not criminals per se, but instead, are people who have made mistakes that can be overcome if they change their lifestyles to those that are crime free. Moreover, CRIPP participants are (1) given individual, as well as group counseling; (2) taught a greater respect for the law; (3) given courses on drug and alcohol abuse; and (4) provided classes designed to increase their marketability upon release by offering them the opportunity to receive a GED and learn computer-related skills. On the other hand, parolees are first sentenced to traditional imprisonment and interact with hardened criminals who have been socialized into the inmate subculture. This socialization has been known to have a negative effect on offenders and is referred to as the prisonization effect. As such, correctional experts contend that traditional confinement exposes offenders to behaviors and experiences that reduce their chance of healthy postrelease adjustment. Regular probationers are in many instances given warnings and inadequate levels of supervision after release. Moreover, they are rarely given any therapeutic rehabilitative treatment. Basically, they are unchanged through the experience of probation. Thus, negative

experiences coupled with improper supervision and treatment-oriented programs, adversely impact the recidivism rates of those placed on probation and parole.

Additionally, the book assessed the attitudes of CRIPP graduates toward the boot camp experience and found that participants with positive attitudes were involved in fewer re-offending activities. Thus, part of this work examined attitudes of CRIPP graduates toward the program and post-release offending. This portion of the analysis focused on attitudinal changes (i.e., positive or negative) and the impact of attitude after release. We found that all six of the programmatic areas of the survey had an impact on reducing recidivism of CRIPP participants. The survey targeted the participant's reinvolverment in crime by examining additional misdemeanors and felonies they committed after the shock incarceration experience. It was expected that if positive attitudinal changes occurred at boot camp, they would go with the offenders into the free community and prevent them from committing additional crimes.

The first of the six items of the survey was: "What they have dished out in here has made me not want to become a criminal." The response to this item was revealed in terms of the number of misdemeanors committed after release by the group of 651 offenders, that 58.7% fell below the mean and 41.3% above the mean. In addition, 61.4 % fell below the mean for committing a felony and 38.6% above the mean. The inference here is that the rigors, punishments, and treatments associated with the boot camp experience were instrumental in keeping many of the CRIPP participants from re-engaging in crime. The figures indicate that the majority of the participants responding to item one desisted from committing misdemeanors and felonies after boot camp. This finding alerts officials of the likelihood that an offender will recidivate upon release. Moreover, if this survey is given before offenders exit the program, it can be determined early if the offenders actually view the program as rigorous and if they are committed to change. It is believed that if offenders feel those involved in the program are serious about reforming offenders then they, too, will take the program seriously and seek reform.

Item Two was "Drug counseling allowed me to kick my illegal drug use." Drug use is very common among offenders. Nearly 87% of offenders in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice - Institutional Division reported that they had tried at least one drug and at least 62% of offenders reported using drugs within 24 hours of committing a crime.

Therefore, drug use has an established presence as it relates to crime in Texas and has possible adverse effects on recidivism rates. The responses to Item Two of the programmatic areas showed that drug use among offenders had significant effects on the incoming and outgoing means. The scale revealed that 66.2% of the sample were below the mean for misdemeanor arrest while 33.8% were above. In terms of felony arrest, 69.9% were below the mean, while 30.1% were above it. These results indicate that CRIPP managed to reduce the level of recidivism or the reinvolvement in crime that could have been drug related. It would appear that CRIPP succeeded in getting nearly 70% of its participants to desist from committing felony crimes while under the influence of drugs and 66% from committing misdemeanors. Studies show that offenders who do not have the benefit of getting help with substance abuse problems while confined stand a greater chance of recidivating when released. This could account for the low level of recidivism for CRIPP participants when compared to regular probationers and parolee groups. Substance abuse treatment is one of the main components of CRIPP. Perhaps the higher recidivism levels found in the other comparisons are related to drug use. It is widely known that many offenders commit crime to obtain the necessary money to support their drug addiction and that others commit crime after being under the influence of drugs. One helpful way to reform offenders is to provide drug and alcohol treatment during some period of their incarceration. This is one of the advantages of CRIPP. Among the many things it does, it also provides drug and alcohol treatment and counseling that regular probationers and parolees rarely receive.

Item Three was "My chances for ever going to college are low." Responses to that item indicate that 68% of the sample were below the mean for misdemeanor arrest and 32% were above. Those offenders below the mean for felony arrest were 66.2%, while 33.8% were above. The implication of this finding is that the offenders accepted they would never attend or graduate from college, but did in fact decide that holding a steady job could increase their buying power and prevent them from engaging in crime. The findings reveal that CRIPP prevented nearly 70% from committing misdemeanors after release, and 66.2% from becoming reinvolvement in committing a felony. Moreover, responses to this question reveal that CRIPP was successful at instilling in participants the idea of engaging in conventional ways of making a living instead of committing criminal activities as a lifestyle. One intent of CRIPP is to teach participants that in order to be productive and law-abiding, one has

to engage in legitimate avenues of employment. This finding is important because many of the participants and those who are arrested do not have consistent or conventional employment histories.

Item Four asked whether the CRIPP training was helpful. Responses revealed that overall, the CRIPP participants did not perceive the program as beneficial. However, the number of arrests for misdemeanors and felonies after CRIPP proved the contrary. For instance, 94.8% of the respondents were below the mean for misdemeanor arrests while 5.2% were above. In terms of felony arrests after CRIPP, 92.4% were below the mean while 7.6% were above. Item Four has been interpreted to mean that if the participants viewed the program as not being helpful they could have eased through the training without being affected by it. However, the results show that even those offenders with the general perception that the program would not have a positive impact on them appeared to have benefitted from the program. The percentages of returns for misdemeanors and felonies prove CRIPP's effectiveness.

Item Five was "I get impatient and begin to fume and fret when other people delay me unnecessarily." Responses to this item revealed that CRIPP participants falling below the mean for misdemeanor arrests were 76%, and 24% were above. Of those arrested for a felony, 77.9% were below the mean, while 22.1% were above. This result means that although CRIPP participants may have had high levels of impulsiveness, 76% of them were not yet arrested for committing misdemeanors after being released from CRIPP for nearly two years. Moreover, 78% had yet to commit a felony. The implication is that since the program places strong emphasis on respecting the law, CRIPP participants have learned that respect. Moreover, scholars consistently argued that those who lack self-control will continue to violate the law if given the opportunity. CRIPP and its various treatment programs are helping to refute this general contention by reporting that after the program, offenders do not quickly reoffend. Moreover, CRIPP appears to teach offenders patience and self-control with a general understanding and respect for the law through its military training. At least, such is revealed by the number of returns and by those answering positively to Item Five.

Item Six was "My present family life is bad." The study of this item revealed that of the CRIPP respondents answering in the affirmative, 85.3% fell below the mean for misdemeanor arrests after the program, while 14.7% were above. With respect to felony arrests, 78.6% were above the mean, and 21.4% were below. The responses imply that although offenders felt that family life adversely affected and influenced

them, the majority of them did not let their negative perception of home life induce them to commit additional crime. Such results can be attributed to the components of CRIPP that are primarily directed at teaching offenders invaluable coping skills. Coping skills are highly stressed at CRIPP because its officials believe that offenders tend to offend and reoffend because they succumb to the stress found in everyday life. While at CRIPP, participants are taught to either suppress anger or redirect it into a positive channel. The program is primarily concerned with the prevention of crime. Therefore, it strives to provide participants with the necessities to have post-release success.

In Chapter Eight, a logistic regression model was used to control for boot camp failure. In the analysis, *fail or no fail* was used as the dependent variable while the independent variables were (1) before felony; (2) offense type - drug; (3) offense type - personal; (4) before misdemeanor; and (6) age. The findings revealed that prior felony; drug offense; personal offenses; prior misdemeanor; and being young are significantly related to boot camp failure. Therefore, offenders with these extra legal factors should not be considered for CRIPP because they are more likely to fail than those without such characteristics. Stated another way, young offenders lacking a criminal record of prior felonies; drug offenses; personal offense; and prior misdemeanors are the best prospects for the Texas boot camp. Individuals without these characteristics could prove to be a drain on limited criminal justice resources, and therefore, should be given a sentence that does not include shock incarceration. Perhaps they can be better served if they are given some other alternative.

Finally, the data were analyzed by demographics and recidivism of CRIPP graduates. We found that several variables influenced recidivism. For example, African-American participants had the highest arrest rates, which is consistent with other research. As far as offense type was concerned, we found that property offenders had the highest recidivism levels. Researchers also found that offense type (property offenders) is a predictor of recidivism. Therefore, scholars find that race and offense type are stable predictors of reinvolvement in crime.

### **Future Considerations**

Because of their early success, CRIPP, DRU and other boot camp programs should be viewed as viable alternatives to traditional imprisonment. As such, boot camps will continue to increase since corrections officials, judges, offenders, the public, and politicians (both

conservative and liberal) endorse the use of such programs. In addition, Congress has provided nearly \$2 billion for creating more boot camps, and conducting evaluation research that addresses their effectiveness.

This book provides evidence that positive attitudinal adjustments from the boot camp experience shape participants' reinvolvement in crime. That is, key aspects of the shock incarceration experience reduced offending behavior by improving coping skills and giving participants the perception that they could turn their lives around if they accepted discipline, respect for the law, and a hard work ethic by seeking employment after release. The data show that the recidivism level is at 20% after the first two years for CRIPP participants, while DRU's recidivism level was 14.4% after the first year. These rates of failure were lower than any of the comparison groups. However, this number changed substantially overtime in Texas. The research revealed that many CRIPP participants were later rearrested on a traffic violation. DRU participants' sparse failure rate continues to impress observers.

The use of boot camps provide positive benefits that are twofold. First, they help the state and offender. For instance, states save money by not having to build new prisons; they increase the number of prison beds needed for serious criminals, and they reduce prison overcrowding. In addition, boot camps serve the best interest of offenders because they provide offenders the opportunity to obtain a healthy respect and appreciation for the law and essentially free them from serving a long-term sentence. Since many offenders entering boot camps were reared in dysfunctional households, the experience serves as a first opportunity for many to acquire self-respect and respect for fellow citizens. Such results are accomplished with the help of drill instructors who act in a surrogate capacity, as the father figure who demands compliance. Since boot camp is patterned after the military, it is thought that participants, like new recruits, will become respectable and law-abiding citizens who will later lead productive lives. This goal guides the CRIPP and DRU programs.

In addition, boot camp programs are cost-effective and are more economical than traditional incarceration. For instance, correctional experts argue that in some states the annual cost for boot camps is \$9,000, while regular incarceration costs \$20,000 per inmate. This is one of the biggest attractions that draw policymakers and correctional administrators to consider boot camps. Indeed, after these findings on CRIPP and DRU, this alternative to incarceration appears to have the double attraction of being effective and affordable. However, each state



must prioritize rehabilitating its offenders. It would be useless to subject an offender to boot camp only to save the state money. The end result could prove disastrous if the state would inevitably have to spend more money because offenders are not rehabilitated or changed by the boot camp experience. If unchanged, these offenders would be recycled or reprocessed into the system, thereby costing the state more than twice as much money. Therefore, the boot camp sentence must be imposed for the sole purpose of reforming the offender, or the state will run the risk of adding to its over-burdened budget.

Boot camps, unlike prison or probation, offer offenders the opportunity for personal development, teach them responsibility, and respect for authority figures. During the 90-day experience, offenders are taught discipline and must endure the rigors of military training in a structured environment. Also, CRIPP and other boot camps provide offenders the opportunity to earn a GED or learn technical skills, thereby making them ready for employment after release. This is a situation that many participants never had prior to program involvement. Furthermore, instead of solely relying on their own expertise, boot camp officials around the country can benefit by the lessons learned from the Alabama DRU experience by asking offenders what works and patterning their respective programs accordingly.

This affords participants better life chances. Therefore, boot camp appears to be more beneficial than the other programs with which they are compared. Moreover, upon their release, offenders are physically healthier than they were prior to their entrance and many have broken negative habits. Their attitudes are changed and they have a mental attitude that respects the law. Moreover, they are placed on probation and become responsible for reporting to probation officers and participating in other treatment programs that are part of the post-shock incarceration treatment process. These programs are designed to ensure successful reentry into society.

A salient point that cannot be overstated is that corrections scholars estimate that the majority of offenders admitted to prison or jail are either addicted to drugs or alcohol. They argue that there is a connection between drug use and crime. They contend that despite many drug users committing crime before eventually trying drugs, still there is a connection between engaging in crime to support one's drug habit. Therefore, drug addiction and alcohol use presents major problems for the criminal justice system. One of the purposes of boot camp is to serve as a form of drug treatment to many participants. For example, DRU has

a very effective Twelve-Step program created to address and treat drug and chemical dependency. CRIPP has built-in mechanisms designed to help "clean up" participants. This treatment aspect of the program increases the probationers' mental capacity and rebuild them physically so that they are healthier and able to think rationally upon release. Boot camp offers participants a safe and structured environment that they would not have if they were incarcerated in a traditional prison setting, or if they were on regular probation. CRIPP, like other boot camps, offers offenders individual and group counseling to help them cope with personal, family, and social problems that often influence their decision making when they consider committing crime. Boot camps address the needs of participants.

No correctional program is without its critics. Some scholars have previously stated that boot camps are mere "net-widening" programs and that serious criminals are not given this sentence. In Chapter Seven, however, 1,006 of 1,225 CRIPP participants were arrested for committing felonies prior to being sentenced to shock incarceration. They were a serious group of criminals who appeared to have been changed after the CRIPP experience. This result has serious implications because correctional and courts officials will discover that boot camps are a viable alternative to traditional imprisonment that targets "real" criminals. Boot camp may, therefore, serve as a sentencing alternative to judges seeking to impose a sentence of intermediate sanction.

Another criticism charged against boot camp is that they engage in cruel and unusual punishment by imposing psychological and physical abuse on participants. Critics charge that these programs unquestionably subject participants to public humiliation, profanity, and expose them to the degradation of women and physical injury. They argue that, as a result of this brief period of confinement, offenders are taught to devalue and develop insensitivities towards women. Moreover, because of public humiliation, they sometimes demonstrate shamelessness. Though critics concede that these forms of abuses are few in number, they contend that even one incident is unacceptable.

Additional criticism exists with regards to boot camps. Some point to several limitations of boot camps: (1) Long-term effects of behavioral changes remain unknown; (2) a large number of legal issues associated with boot camps have gone unaddressed, and (3) managerial problems have been reported. Critics feel that it is a mistake for offenders to avoid long periods of detention. They argue the amount of time spent in the boot camp is too brief to reform offenders. Finally, another concern is

the quality of aftercare given to those released. Without attention to follow-up services for boot camp graduates (i.e. intensive probation), any positive adjustment in graduates' attitudes could be negated. Therefore, the future of boot camps hinge on the quality of aftercare services that offenders receive after they are released. This salient aspect of probation must work together with boot camps to continue the needed services. Failure to do so could negate the therapeutic components (e.g. attitudinal changes) of boot camp.

To date over 3,000 offenders have graduated from the Harris County, Texas CRIPP boot camp program. The findings are encouraging in that CRIPP is a viable intermediate sanction for Harris County, Texas, and potentially for other local jurisdictions considering implementing similar programs. However, we caution that CRIPP's findings cannot be generalized to all boot camps across the country. We argue that each shock incarceration program is different and states determine the success of their programs by using different standards and measures. While each boot camp is predicated on rationales that include saving on inmate costs, reducing the need to build more prisons, reducing scarce bed space, and rehabilitating the offenders, each boot camp is unique and has its own philosophy.

# GLOSSARY

## Chapter 1

***arrest*** - to legally detain, take into custody or apprehend as a suspect or an offender to answer charges.

***boot camp*** - a short-term (usually 90-120 days) correctional treatment program modeled after the military boot camp. It emphasizes the use of drill instructors (DIs) and correctional officers to instill discipline, marching and physical training along with other treatment components to reform offenders. This “tough” approach is designed to shock inmates into a life of conformity and to divert them from traditional imprisonment.

***community supervision programs*** - correctional programs that use the community as an alternative to traditional incarceration. They allow the offenders to remain in the community under some form of supervision e.g. half-way house, probation, electronic monitoring, etc.

***confinement*** - the act of locking up an offender and taking away his freedom while he or she is briefly detained to answer charges. Also occurs when people are held for an extensive period of time after being found guilty of committing crime.

***conservatives*** - persons with a political ideology, generally associated with the Republican Party, who believe in getting tough on criminals by imposing harsh sentences and punishment. They are strong advocates of the crime control model and the death penalty.

***conservative approach*** - to support a moderate course of action that demonstrates a “get tough” approach on crime and criminals. Persons whose ideas advance the argument of individual responsibility.

***correctional facility*** - a building or a place of confinement designed to keep offenders and inmates in secure custody and treatment to serve out their criminal sentence. These facilities can be minimum, medium or maximum security.

***court order*** - a mandate, command or direction from a judge or some

other judicial officer which must be followed to prevent further punishment.

***criminal justice system*** - a set of components which interact with one another to administer fairness. The components of the American criminal justice system include the police, courts, and corrections. They work together to administer fundamental fairness and to protect civil and constitutional rights.

***diversion*** - to officially suspend, or move an offender from the traditional criminal justice system toward an informal approach. They are used since the traditional incarceration is regarded as harmful to offenders. The traditional system labels offenders convicts and attaches stigma.

***drug use*** - the intake of illegal substances that are not prescribed by medical doctors for medicinal purposes. They can be injected, snorted or digested; the misuse of any illegal substance or the abuse of any substance for the purpose of altering one's state of consciousness or to achieve euphoria.

***electronic monitoring (EM)*** - the use of a device worn by an offender on his ankle which transmits a signal over a phone line to a monitoring agency. EM is used to detect movement. It is typically used by offenders who are placed under house arrest.

***"get tough"*** - a legislative and political movement that emerged in the early 1980s to demonstrate taking a serious stand against offenders versus the 1970s emphasis on rehabilitation and treatment. Boot camps were a part of the "get tough" approach of the 1980s.

***hardened criminals*** - offenders who have chosen criminal or deviant behavior as their way of life. Typically, they are offenders with extensive histories of crime. They are also those who routinely commit the most serious offenses.

***house arrest*** - a monitored commitment to one's home or place of residence which began being used in the 1950s; a sentence imposed by the court that legally requires offenders to remain confined in their home.

***intermediate sanction*** - a punishment or sentence somewhere between the loose supervision of probation and the secure custodial supervision of regular prison. Boot camps are considered an intermediate sanction as are many community treatment programs. These punishments are used when state correctional budgets face crisis and the offender's crime is not serious.

***judicial officer*** - any person authorized by constitution, statute, or court rule to exercise those powers reserved to the judicial branch of government, e.g., a judge is a judicial officer.

***liberal*** - a political ideology of someone who believes in treatment and rehabilitation versus punishment and is against the death penalty (the opposite of conservative). Liberals are strong advocates of the due process model which adheres to constitutional protections and procedural safeguards.

***liberal approach*** - to take the stance that programs which treat are a better approach to preventing and solving the crime problem than to exclusively punish.

***long-term incarceration*** - imprisonment in a penal institution for full sentence under the "three strikes and you're out" program or a title given to career and habitual criminal. Such imprisonment does not normally earn "good time" toward a reduced sentence. Long-term incarceration also refers to serving a complete life sentence without the prospect of having it reduced.

***net-widening*** - a correctional concept which suggests that alternatives to regular incarceration, such as boot camps, electronic monitoring or any other such option, merely add to or expand the prisoner population. Typically, it is mentioned in the context of state authority superimposing its will on those who are not "real" offenders and have committed minor crimes.

***offender*** - any adult who has been convicted of violating a state criminal code and has been processed is referred to as a criminal offender.

***prison*** - a state or federal confinement or correctional facility having custodial authority over adults or certified juveniles who have been guilty of committing a felony and given a sentence of more than a year.

***prison overcrowding*** - a reality faced in many correctional systems or prisons due to the increasing numbers of offenders incarcerated (career or habitual criminals) and strict sentencing guidelines. It has caused correctional facilities to expand and exceed capacity and sometimes be placed under court order. It also creates safety concerns and violates the constitution.

***punitive model*** - any correctional approach which advocates using punishment to correct offender behavior rather than applying the medical model, which emphasizes providing treatment.

***recidivism*** - repeating criminal behavior after being released from a correctional institution. An offender is considered a recidivist if he reoffends within three years after being released back into the community.

***regular probation*** - the direct and conditional release by a judicial officer to an alleged or adjudicated adult or juvenile offender as long as he or she meets certain conditions while under minimal supervision.

***rehabilitation*** - correctional plans to reform offenders through treatment and educational programs.

***severe punishment*** - any pain, suffering or penalty or confinement which is inflicted beyond the scope of the criminal law or court sentence and which exceeds the intent of the law. Typically, imposed to demonstrate disdain and intolerance for certain criminal behavior.

***short-term programs*** - are designed to rehabilitate or treat within less than a six months duration, generally 90-120 days, such as a boot camp sentence. They are not meant to punish to the full extent of the law. They, too, are considered diversions and a reprieve from traditional imprisonment.

***strict discipline*** - those regimented actions associated with getting inmates to readily comply with the rules of an institution or facility. It

is usually found within a paramilitary structure such as a shock incarceration program which requires complete compliance. This approach was common placed in many prisons in the 60s and 70s under the power and control models used by prison administrators.

***strict mandatory sentences*** - a statutory requirement that certain penalties must be enforced and carried out in all cases of conviction for a specified offense or group of offenses.

***super intensive probation*** - conditional freedom granted by a judicial officer with strict supervision and conditions exceeding conventional probationary status. These programs have strict and challenging conditions of release, such as random drug testing; work; community services; curfews; weekly meetings with probation officers and others.

***traditional imprisonment*** - incarceration in a penal institution under the state or Federal system, which has a conventional facility for convicted adult offenders and a set of rules promoting good behavior and for which violations can result in the loss of good time or solitary confinement.

***treatment*** - any program designed to reform, change or make over an offender while under correctional supervision. These programs are provided so that offenders will have a successful reintegration into society.

## Chapter 2

***activity therapy*** - use of game and role playing to teach problem solving techniques, self-control, and socialization. It is especially useful for resistant individuals, such as delinquents. The goal of such program is to modify behavior that will remain with the individual after therapy.

***adult probation*** - programs that specifically target those in the age of majority. They are diverted from places of confinement and made accountable to probation officers who supervise them.

***Alcoholics Anonymous (AA)*** - a voluntary fellowship founded in 1935 to help with the personal recovery and sobriety of its members. Through a 12 step approach, the program has been the driving force to create an awareness of alcoholism being a disease.



***alcohol treatment*** - any program designed to treat alcoholics (those who have problems abusing alcohol) to include AA, individual counseling and treatment, and even certain medications.

***Army Military Police School*** - a United States Army training facility located at Fort McClellan, Alabama to train military police officers, non-commissioned officers, enlisted persons and designated civilians (such as drill instructors for civilian correctional boot camps) in all aspects of law enforcement, corrections, and combat military police support.

***career criminals*** - habitual offenders with a past or extensive record of multiple arrests and convictions for serious crimes; persons with a large number of arrests for committing serious crime. These persons are often referred to as chronic, repeat, or serious offenders.

***classical criminology*** - the first school of crime causation associated with Cesare Beccaria and Jeremy Bentham. This theory assumes that crime is a product of an individual's free will, rational decision-making, and hedonism. The school advocates that deterrence (punishment) should prevent crime if people are rational.

***criminal history*** - past law violations generally recorded in official records.

***delinquency*** - any act, criminal or non-criminal (status offenses) committed by a juvenile generally through age 17, which can be referred to the juvenile or family court. Some states limit the juvenile age to 16 years.

***determinism*** - a theory of criminology embraced by the Positivistic School that rejected the argument of free will, rational decision-making, and hedonism as reasons for crime. Determinism posits that offenders are propelled toward crime by forces (biological, psychological, social) beyond their control. Positivism holds the position that crime is predetermined. Generally, offenders lack control over their behavior and should therefore be treated rather than punished.

***deterrence*** - a theory that advances that swift, certain and severe punishment (apprehension and incarceration) will discourage others from the same or similar illegal acts. Generally, we think of two types of

deterrence: (1) General, which targets the broader society and (2) specific, which targets the individual offender.

***discipline*** - the exercise and enforcement of strict rules to ensure compliance under stress.

***Elmira Reformatory*** - the first reformatory built in the United States. The facility used indeterminate sentences (parole); classification of prisoners; education; vocational training; and military training to keep prisoners occupied under Warden Zebulon Brockway.

***free will*** - a term normally associated with the Classical School of Criminology, which recognized that the individual offender voluntarily chooses to commit an illegal act.

***General Equivalency Diploma (GED)*** - passing of this test is equal to acquiring a high school diploma.

***inmate labor*** - work performed by anyone who is institutionalized in a correctional facility. The concept was very popular in the 60s and early 70s, especially in Texas. During this time, inmate labor helped to sustain the Texas Department of Corrections by making economic contributions for its own upkeep.

***intensive basic training*** - the use of strict standards of discipline and stress during training to prepare trainees to survive under adverse conditions.

***Juvenile Awareness Project*** - commonly called the "Scared Straight" program involving interactions with troubled juveniles and inmates sentenced to life at the Rahway State Prison in Rahway, New Jersey. The three hour sessions included taking juveniles headed towards a criminal career path on a tour of the maximum security prison to have a two hour confrontation with inmates. After the program, a success rate of 90% was claimed, but research later revealed the success of the program was exaggerated and used samples of juveniles who were not serious delinquents. Some even charged that Scared Straight actually increased participants' involvement in delinquency.

***juvenile delinquent*** - a child generally under the age of 18 who is adjudicated delinquent and found guilty by a juvenile or family court for an offense under the courts jurisdiction. This offense may either be criminal or non-criminal acts called status offenses such as truancy, smoking, and running away.

***low self-control*** - the quality of acting impulsively and lacking the inability to resist the temptations of deviant and criminal behavior.

***military ceremonies*** - those activities in the military that involve marching and precise movements. These movements may be performed as an individual or a member of a group, such as a squad or platoon.

***military structure*** - a hierarchal organization with a rank structure.

***military training approach*** - the use of operant conditioning to acquire individual performance with repetition and with soldiers responding to the orders. For example, at the words "gas," the soldier has nine seconds to put on his protective gas mask and check it for proper functioning.

***Narcotics Anonymous (NA)*** - similar to Alcoholic Anonymous. The program uses the same 12 steps and is voluntary to help drug addicts with personal recovery.

***offender populations*** - any group of persons convicted of criminal acts, such as all property criminals.

***operant conditioning*** - see above definition concerning the military training approach. In the laboratory setting of B.F. Skinner's experiments on behavior modification, this approach was called operant conditioning. It is widely used in juvenile corrections, as well as in the military and involves learning through the use of rewards and punishments.

***pains of imprisonment*** - refers to Gresham Sykes's study on the effects of prison, which includes: deprivation of heterosexual relationships, liberty, inability to do what you want (freedom), loss of privacy, security, and personal autonomy.

***positivism*** - (a major scientific trend in criminological theory that emerged during the 19<sup>th</sup> century associated with the deterministic view

of human behavior or the alternative view of classical criminology). It led to the use of the treat models and influenced the Kennedy and Johnson administrations to invest in programs designed to restructure society.

***prevention*** - any activity designed to stop crime or offenses before they occur or to control such acts once they happen.

***probation*** - a legal term which defines the conditional release of an offender by a judge to an adult or juvenile probation officer in charge of supervision.

***probation supervision*** - normally exercised by a probation officer which includes counseling, supervising, and monitoring a probationers whereabouts and referring offenders to various social service agencies as needed.

***Rahway Prison*** - formerly the maximum security state prison for the State of New Jersey which was the birth place of the "Scared Straight" program.

***rational choice*** - a theory of criminality that is referred to as neoclassical and deterrence. It assumes that offenders will engage in crime after weighing the benefits of violating the law and the prospect of not getting caught. If they believe that they can successfully allude justice and do not fear the threat of punishment, they will commit crime if the opportunity presents itself.

***Reality Therapy*** - a treatment theory developed by William Glasser, which forces individual offenders and delinquents to accept responsibility and consequences for their actions.

***rearrest*** - the recidivism of an offender; to be legally detained a second time or more after release from a correctional facility.

***reconviction*** - when an offender commits a new offense and in the judgement of a court, based on a jury or a judicial officer, is found guilty.

***reform*** - the act of changing an offender for the best; being rehabilitated or restored to law-abiding status.

***regular probationers*** - individual offenders, juvenile or adult, who have been granted conditional freedom by a judicial officer for an alleged or adjudged offense and who are placed on minimal supervision.

***Rehabilitation Training Instructors Course (RTIC)*** - a two week course offered by the United States Army Military Police School located at Fort McClellan, Alabama for civilian boot camp drill instructors to prepare them to work in boot camp programs.

***reincarceration*** - to be reimprisoned in a penal institution for a sentence received as a result of a conviction for a crime or violation of probation or parole.

***"Scared Straight"*** - see Juvenile Awareness Project.

***shock probation*** - the forerunner to boot camps where an offender was sentenced to a short prison term and would be released after 90 days to serve the remainder of his or her sentence under supervised probation; commonly referred to as a "split sentence," which gave an offender a taste of prison to "shock" him into conformity.

***shock probationers*** - a popular sentence in the 1970s imposed on offenders who were given a split sentence of serving a brief period of confinement and later placed on shock probation.

***U.S. Army Correctional Training Facility (CTF)*** - the military version of a boot camp that started at the height of the Vietnam War to salvage young military offenders who faced regular confinement and discharge. It used an intensive boot camp approach consisting of strict discipline, marching, physical training, adventure training and various treatment components, such as individual and group counseling, milieu therapy, and activity therapy to increase an offender's self-esteem, confidence and self image.

***U.S. Army Retraining Brigade (USARB)*** - the current name of the former Correctional Training Facility (CTF) when the United States Army switched from the draft to the volunteer Army concept. Essentially, the USARB had the same mission as CTF (save soldiers from discharge and put them back into the manpower system).

***Yates Law*** - law enacted by Congress that abolished inmate labor that successfully competed with the private sector in New York and created resentment from civilians.

### Chapter 3

***Alabama Disciplinary Rehabilitation Unit (DRU)*** - the formal name for the Alabama Boot Camp Program that subjects participants to a 90 day rigorous paramilitary regimen consisting of marching, discipline; drill and ceremonies; individual and group counseling; employment training; and other aspects of treatment.

***Alabama Criminal Code*** - the laws for the State of Alabama, which include the substantive law and the punishment for each crime.

***criminal justice arsenal*** - a list of responses to crimes, programs to prevent or control crimes, or mechanisms under state authority to control criminal behavior.

***drug use data*** - reports concerning the use of illegal substances, i.e., type of drug use and number of times. The Justice Department has data on Drug Use Forecasting. These data are collected when offenders are first arrested. They include the type of drugs and the regularity that offenders use them.

***first-time offenders*** - generally adult offenders who have been convicted for the first time of a felony crime. They are without criminal histories or prior records of law violations.

***history of drug use*** - usually a list of self-reported illegal substance abuse obtained from offenders as they are processed into a correctional facility or when a probation officer is filling out a Pre-Sentence Investigation.

***nets of incarceration*** - also referred to as the nets of social control. Typically, used to demonstrate the extent and far reaching power of the criminal justice system.

***nonviolent offenders*** - offenders or criminals who have generally committed property or drug crimes and have not committed acts such as murder, rape, robbery or assault.

***offender groups*** - the grouping of offenders or criminals who have committed similar crimes e.g., all property criminals or all first offenders of non-violent crimes.

***plea bargain*** - a practice involving negotiations between the defense attorney, prosecutor, and judge on behalf of an offender charged with committing a crime. If the process is successful, the offender enters a guilty plea (generally to a lesser offense) in exchange for a reduced sentence.

***pre-sentence reports*** - a report prepared from a pre-sentence investigation (PSI) which is normally conducted by a probation officer to help assist the sentencing authority (judge) in deciding case dispositions after a guilty plea or finding.

***program completion*** - when an offender successfully finishes and satisfies the requirements of a rehabilitation program.

***program failure*** - occurs when an individual does not satisfy the requirements of a particular rehabilitation program

***self-reported history*** - a history or account of an individual's life experiences obtained through an interview with that person or through a survey instrument, which assumes that he or she is telling the truth since official records are not used and are sometimes inaccurate.

***substance abuse*** - the misuse of illegal drugs or any chemical property used for its effects on bodily processes.

***Twelve Step Model*** - initially developed by Alcoholics Anonymous as a strategy to change the lives of substance abusers. Many correctional treatment programs are now implementing the twelve step approach to help offenders end drug addiction and change.

***Wash outs*** - Offenders who are victims of attribution at shock incarceration programs. They are those who fail because of physical or disciplinary reasons. They are subsequently returned to the judge and given a traditional sentence.

## Chapter 4

***Alabama Department of Central Records*** - the place that stores official records within the Alabama Department of Corrections on all offenders in the state under correctional control. It maintains hard copy and microfiche records on current and past inmates.

***Alabama Department of Corrections*** - the state agency responsible for incarcerating offenders sentenced in the Alabama court system. The department has approximately 22,000 inmates housed in places of confinement throughout the state.

***alternatives to incarceration*** - covers the sentencing options other than traditional imprisonment that range from various community-based treatment programs, such as half-way houses; boot camp; super intensive probation; community service or restitution to regular probation.

***Boot Camp Inmate Questionnaire*** - an open-ended survey instrument designed to elicit inmate responses and opinions about the Alabama boot camp experience at the Disciplinary Rehabilitation Unit. Used in an evaluation study of DRU, the survey contained six items measuring the experiences of Alabama participants.

***closed-ended questions*** - questions on a survey instrument which generally provide specific responses and which do not allow for detailed or descriptive response. The structure of these questions create concerns over validity.

***community service*** - an alternative to corrections for some offenders or a correctional practice in which an offender must perform public works or voluntary service, either in lieu of confinement or in conjunction with serving time or while on probation.

***condition of release*** - the granting of freedom to an inmate contingent upon his or her obeying specified rules of behavior. When conditions are violated, revocation and sentence could be forthcoming.

***corrections guards*** - those individuals working at a correctional facility who have a primary duty devoted to maintaining custody and control over inmates.



***correctional practices*** - any activity which evolves around the incarceration of inmates.

***criminal history*** - an account of an individual's involvement in offending or in criminal law violations. Some official criminal records are maintained in computers such as the Computerized Criminal History of the Federal Bureau Investigations.

***criminal personality*** - a theory of crime developed by Samuel Yochelson and Clifford Samenow that advances the argument that crime results from poor thinking and choices that criminals make. Most importantly, the theory advocates individual responsibility.

***Disciplinary Rehabilitation Unit (DRU)*** - the formal name for the Alabama Boot Camp Program.

***drill instructor*** - the most significant element associated with boot camps whose function is similar to a United States Marine Corps Drill Sergeant (i.e., bark out orders, enforce discipline, march troops, supervise work groups, counsel participants and serve as a positive role model).

***formal evaluations*** - official assessments of programs to determine if they are effective and efficient.

***hardened criminals*** - those inmates who become recalcitrant as a result of repeated offenses and incarceration and who are determined not to change.

***Kilby Correctional Facility*** - a member facility of the Alabama Department of Corrections. It serves as the Diagnostic and Evaluations Unit. Kilby Correctional Facility is also where the Alabama DRU program was first located.

***Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI)*** - is a test given to inmates as they are processed into a facility to aid in the diagnosis of personality disorders. In clinical use, the MMPI can be used to help identify a patient's or inmate's personality disorders such as depression, paranoia, or schizophrenia.

***open-ended responses*** - the opposite of closed-ended survey questions which allow a respondent to give detailed and descriptive answers which are usually considered more valid.

***personal development*** - those constructive measures that offenders take to develop as a law-abiding personality.

***Phase One*** - the first month or 30 days of Alabama's boot camp experience. It is known as the "Confrontation Phase" where inmates must face and accept their behavior and admit to wrong doings.

***Phase Two*** - the second month of the Alabama boot camp experience that is referred to as the "Discovery Phase." It is during this period that inmates realize that they must avoid trouble and make proper choices. Further, they learn that they have the internal values to live crime free.

***Phase Three*** - the third month of the Alabama boot camp experience. It is referred to as the "Pre-release Phase" since it covers areas that are designed to prepare an offender for return to the free community.

***post-release supervision*** - the monitoring activity given to each offender after they are returned to the community on probation. Typically, it is a condition of release.

***pre-release training*** - those actions created to prepare offenders for their return to the community. These include teaching releasees how to maintain a check book, interviewing skills, or how to obtain needed social services. Thus, training is provided to increase the life chances of offenders.

***problem-solving techniques*** - any approach which helps offenders maintain control in the face of stress, anger and other challenges encountered daily. The function of these techniques is to offer effective coping skills.

***rational choice*** - a decision gathered after proper reasoning, i.e., a

decision that a reasonable person would favor given similar circumstances.

***Rational Choice Theory*** - an earlier criminological theory formerly called classical that reemerged during the latter 1970s and early 1980s. It is also referred to as Neoclassical theory. It assumes that offenders make rational and conscious decisions to engage in crime. Furthermore, the theory contends that offenders weigh the advantages and disadvantages associated with the crime and consider the possibility of apprehension.

***rigorous physical labor*** - work which requires great physical agility and is designed to instill discipline, a sense of accomplishment, and self-confidence.

***self-discipline*** - the ability of an individual to follow rules without engaging in impulsive actions; the ability to resist temptation without threat of punishment.

***self-discovery*** - the act of an individual being able to understand his or her own actions, motivations, and thought process. This concept is a key aspect of the Alabama Boot camp experience.

***Self-Help Counseling Program*** - a treatment program which depends on the individual being able to assist him or herself without the use of additional resources.

***shock incarceration*** - another name for boot camps; a descriptive term of what boot camps are designed to do, i.e., shock or scare an offender into going straight by locking them up. Since, many boot camps are located on or near prison facilities, it is hoped that the participants will understand the reality of the criminal path that they are taking and change accordingly.

***theoretical treatment approaches*** - any treatment oriented program that has as its basis a theory such as psychotherapy based on Freud's psychoanalytic theory. Theories provide explanations regarding why behaviors occur. As such, those who design treatment strategies around scientific research have the benefit of relying on experts to provide

offenders with the help they need within the context of treatment environments.

***Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act*** - the 1994 Crime Bill passed by the 103<sup>rd</sup> Congress and signed into law by President William Clinton authorizing over \$30.2 billion for law enforcement and crime prevention activities. Such activities include increasing the scope of the federal death penalty, placing more police officers on the streets, providing more aid for prison construction, and creating more boot camps and research.

## Chapter 5

***attitudinal changes*** - refers to measuring whether offenders have made improvements or changes with respect to beliefs after being subjected to correctional treatment. The instrument used in attitudinal research is a questionnaire that provides a Likert Scale to measure variance. Attitudinal change is measured by giving participants a before and after survey and comparing the results to detect if the stimuli impacted change. It is typically referred to as behavior modification. Some think of it as an indicator of reform and a predictor of future behavior. The concept is used within the context of social scientific research.

***conditions of parole*** - those terms of behavior by which an inmate must abide upon release from a correctional facility prior to completion of a court sentence.

***cost-effective*** - determining whether a program or a course of action saves money and is economically efficient i.e., worth the investment cost and the amount saved versus another program or course of action. It is usually associated with diversions to incarceration or intermediate sanctions.

***Court Regimented Intensive Probation Program (CRIPP)*** - the formal title of the Texas boot camp program located in Humble, Texas (Harris County). Created in 1991, the program was designed to reduce the number of offenders going into the Texas Department of Criminal Justice Institutional Division, save the state monies by freeing bed space for serious criminals and preventing Texas from having to build more prisons and help reduce high levels of recidivism.

***Criminal Justice Policy Council*** - A criminal justice reform committee in Harris County, Texas designed to assist the Texas Punishment Standards Commission in their policy development. The commission, headed by Dr. Tony Fabelo, provides an overview of the impact of recidivism on the Texas criminal justice system.

***Harris County Lifestyles Survey*** - a survey used to collect data on CRIPP participants in Harris County, Texas. The survey contains 91 items measuring demographics; family structure and functionalism; criminality; perceptions of opportunities; drug and alcohol addiction; perceptions of CRIPP; and others.

***intensive probation supervision*** - strict supervision of probationers, which usually consists of monitoring; weekly contact visits with a probation officer; work; random drug tests; community services; curfew; and in some cases paying restitution to victims. This form of probation is intensive and long lasting, causing many participants to violate technical conditions and to be returned to prison.

***Justice Information Management System (JIMS)*** - a database that contains criminal records on all offenders who have been processed by the Harris County, Texas criminal justice system. Containing over 42 million records, it is considered the most extensive database system in the nation.

***post-release adjustment*** - the manner in which inmates make the transition from incarceration to their return to the free community after serving a sentence or being placed on either probation or parole.

***Six Programmatic Areas*** - contained in the Harris County Lifestyles Survey, these areas asked the Texas boot camp participants questions in the following areas: (1) Perceptions of boot camp staff; (2) drugs and alcohol counseling; (3) perceptions of future opportunities; (4) general perception of boot camp program; (5) impulsivity and self-control; and (6) family situation.

***Super Intensive Probation Program (SIPP)*** - a condition of release from the Texas CRIPP boot camp program. After completion of boot camp, offenders are then placed in SIPP. While in SIPP, offenders are subjected to the rigid conditions of probation such as hard work,

community service, random drug test, curfew and others. SIPP also serves as part of aftercare treatment provided graduates from shock incarceration programs. For example, it provides offenders further drug and alcohol treatment and counseling programs if they desire. SIPP also helps participants find employment. After successfully finishing SIPP, offenders are placed on regular probation, which is less structured and controlling.

## Chapter 6

***Battle Dress Uniform (BDU)*** - replaces the old combat fatigues and the traditional work or battle uniform for the soldiers in the United States Army. It is the typical dress wear for military personnel depending on the events. This wear is commonly found at many correctional boot camps across the country.

***chain of command*** - the hierarchy of an organization structure that begins with the lowest and moves towards the highest level.

***cohort*** - a group of people who have commonalities that could be demographic, criminality, or other characteristics. The commonalities assist where generalizability is concerned. (For example, the famous delinquency in a Birth Cohort Study by Wolfgang, Sellin and Figlio of males born in 1945 in Philadelphia, PA tracked from their 10<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> birthday found that a small number of youth accounted for over one-half of the offenders committed). Other famous cohort studies include the works of Shannon and Farrington.

***discipline*** - being both trained to act according to rules and punished for the purpose of correction.

***group counseling*** - a treatment approach where the members of a group encourage and reinforce each other by participating in counseling sessions. This treatment approach facilitates feedback and participation from everyone involved. This signals to participants that the issues they confront are not unique and if others are successfully managing similar concerns, so too can they. This treatment approach is used at many correctional facilities.

***Harris County Sheriff's Department*** - the law enforcement agency for Harris County, Texas including Houston, which has its own police department jurisdiction. The department provides security and training needs for the CRIPP boot camp. Some officers at the Sheriff's Department are drill instructors.

***individual counseling*** - one-on-one therapy sessions between the offender and the counselor that is designed to diagnose and treat the offender's problem.

***law and order*** - a typical phrase used to signify a tough stand on crime. The term is a favorite among conservative politicians seeking office. Many of them base their entire platform on having a zero tolerance for crime and demonstrate their commitment to reducing crime by being a top crime fighter.

***life skill training*** - those essential areas that correctional officials identify with healthy living and survival such as a work ethic; literacy; anger management; disease prevention; and drug and alcohol counseling.

***marching*** - that portion of drill and ceremonies deeply entrenched in military training that emphasizes individuals and groups having the ability to do various walking movements in cadence.

***physical training*** - exercise associated with the military such as jogging, running, swimming, and other practices that promote agility and endurance. However, they also include adventure activities like repelling and confidence courses. Successful completion of these activities gives participants a feeling of accomplishment and promote group cohesion.

***Sentencing Alternative Intensive Program (SAIP)*** - a Texas boot camp that was created under Senate Bill 245 at the same time as CRIPP. Its function was to reduce recidivism, free limited bed space for hardened criminals, and prevent the state from having to build more expensive prisons.

***substance abuse treatment*** - those programs designed to help a person end drug dependency and abuse of illegal substances. These programs are created to treat and end drug and chemical addiction.

***Texas Department of Criminal Justice - Institutional Division*** - formerly known as the Texas Department of Corrections, this component of the Texas criminal justice system is primarily concerned with offenders sentenced to all correctional facilities. These include jails and prisons of all security classifications.

***Work*** - considered within the context of confinement as therapy for offenders. It instills responsibility and keeps offenders occupied engaging in constructive activities that will be used after they are released.

## Chapter 7

***extralegal variables*** - typically referred to as demographic factors that include an offender's age, race, gender, and class.

***fail*** - a concept that is commonly used to express that an offender has not successfully completed an intermediate sanction program. The act of not passing, i.e., to fail intensive supervision probation.

***no fail*** - a concept that commonly expresses that an offender has successfully completed an intermediate sanction program. The act of completing, i.e., to finish the boot camp experience.

***offender risk assessment*** - a management technique used to determine which offenders are those who are more likely to reoffend or recidivate after release. For example, some offenders are evaluated on factors such as type of offense and chemical dependency.

***prior offenses*** - crimes previously committed by an offender, which resulted in arrest, conviction, or revocation of probation or parole.

***self-help programs*** - those treatment approaches rely on the individual to seek assistance without waiting for outside direction or guidance. Offenders on parole and probation are advised that social service programs are available to them upon their release.



## Chapter 8

***aftercare*** - programs provided to offenders after release from places of confinement or intermediate sanctions. They offer offenders rehabilitation and treatment services considered essential to law-abiding behavior.

***aftercare programs*** - service agencies within the community that provide needed assistance to offenders being reintegrated with the free community. Some agencies provide employment placement; others provide education and counseling services.

***aftercare services*** - programs designed to assist and treat former participants of shock incarceration or others who have been treated by correctional authority. They are created to help participants reintegrate back into society.

***American Penal System*** - includes all institutions and programs of rehabilitation and punishment for those who have violated the laws governing society. These institutions include local and county jails and maximum, medium, minimum and private prisons.

***community resources*** - programs that communities appropriate to assist offenders in making reforms. Assisting offenders take a community wide effort if it is to be successful. As such, successful programs are wide range. They include educational and job training, job placement, counseling sessions, drug and alcohol treatment and others.

***criminogenic factors*** - negative features of the human condition that are disproportionately found in socially disorganized and economically challenged environments. They foster deviant producing behavior and exacerbate social problems that proliferate in these areas. They are gun availability; poverty; joblessness; drug addiction; prostitution; gangs; hopelessness and despair; and a lack of legitimate opportunities.

***dysfunctional communities*** - those geographical areas characterized as socially disorganized whereby residents do not trust each other, have little in common, and provide little if any control over the behavior of teenage groups. These are places where crime and delinquent behavior are saturated. They lack economic resources and do not provide younger

generations with conventional opportunities to succeed in a competitive society.

***Phase One of Aftercare*** - aspect of the program that allows participants to leave the center for employment purposes or to attend programs providing aftercare services.

***Phase Two of Aftercare*** - aspect of the program that is referred to as the pre-release stage. Those reaching this phase are allowed to leave the center, but must return at night.

***Phase Three of Aftercare*** - offenders are released and are required to participate in intensive home confinement that includes electronic monitoring.

***random drug testing*** - the arbitrary monitoring of an offender's use of illegal drugs. Because of unscheduled checks, the process requires that offenders remain free of drug use. A failure to successfully pass discretionary monitoring could mean that offenders violate the sobriety condition imposed on their probation or parole status, and thus might be returned to prison.

***readjustment*** - the quality of reintegrating back to the free community after release from a traditional place of confinement or an intermediate sanction program.

***revocation*** - refers to withdrawing privileges due to inappropriate or illegal behavior, or technical violation committed by an offender on either probation or parole. This course of action is serious since the offender's freedom is in jeopardy. Because they face the prospect of being returned to prison, offenders must be afforded a judicial hearing to ensure that due process is protected.



## INDEX

### A

- AA (see Alcoholics Anonymous)
- Activity Therapy (see Therapy)
- ADC (see Alabama Department of Corrections)
- ADCR ( see Alabama Department of Central Records)
- Adult education, 25
- Adult probation (see Probation)
- Adult Probation Commission's Statistical Survey (see Survey)
- Aftercare, 55, 142
  - Counseling, 100
  - Job assistance, 100
  - Phase One, 101
  - Phase Three, 101
  - Phase Two, 101
  - Programs, 82, 93, 96, 102, 142
  - Provisions, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 105
    - Counseling, 99
    - Effect of, 98
    - Work skills, 99
    - Monitoring, 99
    - Supervision, 99
  - Services, 60, 100, 101, 103, 142
  - Substance abuse treatment, 100
  - Vocational training, 100
- AIDS (see Counseling)
- Akers, R. L., 35, 44
- Alabama, 4, 11, 12, 26, 33, 34, 35
  - Board of Pardons and Parole, 28
  - Boot camp phases, 36
  - Boot camp program, 4, 26, 27, 29, 39
    - Age limit, 35
  - Components
    - Hard work, 4
    - Marching, 4
    - Physical training, 4

- Childersburg Prison, 34
- Correctional officers, 36
- Criminal Code, 26, 31, 131
- Department of Central Records, 133
- Department of Corrections, 42, 133
- Department of Corrections Central Records Office, 28, 39
- Department of Corrections Files, 28
- Disciplinary Rehabilitation Unit (see entry)
- Fort McClellan, 11
- Inmates, 35
- Participants, 35
- Phase One, 135, 143
- Phase Three, 135, 143
- Phase Two, 135, 143
- Prison officials, 40
- Rehabilitation Training Instructors Course, 11, 130
- Research Monitoring and Evaluation Office, 28
- Staff, 35
- Alcohol counseling, 59
- Alcohol usage, 59
- Alcohol treatment (see Programs)
- Alcoholics Anonymous, 13, 29, 36, 37, 101, 125
  - Twelve-Steps, 4, 26, 29, 36, 132
- Allen, H. E., 8, 9, 20, 23
- Alpha Barracks (see Barracks)
- Alternative strategies (see Overcrowding)
- Alternatives to imprisonment, (see Imprisonment)
- Alternatives to incarceration, 25, 33, 59, 89, 103
- Altschuler, D. M., 100, 102, 106
- American correctional system, 7, 111
- American Penal System, 142
- Anderson, J. F., 28, 31, 33, 34, 44, 49, 62, 80, 81, 82, 84, 97, 98, 99, 106, 107, 108
- Anderson, R., 90, 95
- Approaches
  - Conservative, 121
  - "Get tough", 2, 51, 122
  - Liberal, 123
  - Military training, 7, 11, 15, 128
  - New training, 7

- Punitive, 11
- Punitive treatment, 4
- Scaring, 15
- Shocking, 8, 15
- Taste of Prison, 15
- Theoretical, 136
- Treatment, 10
- Twelve-Step, 30
- Arizona, 51, 102, 103, 105
- Armstrong, T. L., 100, 102, 106
- Army's Military Police School (see U. S. Army)
- Army Standards (see U. S. Army)
- Arrests, 2, 114, 115, 121
- Attitudinal changes, 61, 137
- Austin, J., 98, 102, 103, 104, 107
- Austin, U. T., 13, 14, 21

## **B**

- BDU (see Battle Dress Uniform)
- Babbie, E., 39, 44
- Background characteristics, (see Disciplinary Rehabilitation Unit)
- Baltimore, 102
- Barlow, H., 9, 20
- Barracks, 69
  - Alpha, 53
  - Charlie, 69
  - Delta, 69
  - Displays (see Boot Camps)
  - Fox Trot, 69
  - Golf, 69
  - Hotel, 69
- Basic literacy (see Life Skills)
- Battle Dress Uniform, 70, 139
- Bean, P., 16, 18, 26
- Beccaria, B., 13, 35, 44
- Beccaria's Theory (see Theory)
- Bedeau, H., 17, 20
- Bentham, B., 16, 17, 20, 35, 44
- Bernard, T., J., 13, 14, 23

- Black, W., 90, 95
- Blum, A., 15, 22
- Board of Pardons and Parole (see Alabama)
- Bolyard, M., 98, 102, 103, 104, 107
- Boot camps, 1, 3, 12, 14, 15, 18, 40, 50, 56, 59, 67, 88, 98, 102, 103, 104, 117, 118, 121
  - (also see Programs, Diversions)
- Baltimore, 102
- Candidates, 29, 30
- Components, 14
  - Barrack displays, 14
  - Discipline, 98
  - Group counseling, 98
  - Hard labor, 98
  - Individual counseling, 98
  - Marching, 14, 98
  - Physical training, 14, 98
- Correctional programs, 50
- Costs, 14
- Demographic characteristics, 55
- Failure, 28, 61, 116
  - Bad attitude, 28
  - Inability to follow rules, 28
  - Insubordination, 28
  - Medical, 28
- Graduates, 75, 88, 102, 103, 105
- Inmate Questionnaire, 39, 42
- Monetary incentives, 51
- Office (see Kilby)
- Officials, 55, 57, 103
- Participants, 37, 42, 67, 75
- Programs, 51, 87, 93, 103, 116
- Program requirements, 60
- Sentence, 18, 75, 98, 99
- Shock incarceration programs, 50
- Strict military discipline, 14
- Success, 61
- Texas, 68, 70, 82
- Bourdouis, J., 8, 20
- Bourque, B., 67, 84, 98, 100, 101, 102, 103

Brockway, Warden Zebulon, 7  
 Buckmaster, D., 9, 21  
 Bureau of  
     Justice Statistics, 73, 84, 104, 107  
     Prisons, 52  
 Burns, J., 33, 44, 51, 62, 67, 81, 84, 98, 99, 107  
 Bursik, R., 17, 20, 21  
 Burton, Jr., V. S., 33, 34, 41, 44, 45, 49, 56, 58, 59, 62, 63

## C

California, 74  
 Candidates (see Boot Camp)  
 Carlson, E., 9, 20  
 Carson, G., 82, 84, 97, 107  
 Chaiken, M. R., 10, 20  
 Chain of command, 139  
 Chamlin, M., 17, 20  
 Champion, D., 56, 62  
 Characteristics  
     Background, 39  
     Demographic, 74  
 Childersburg Prison (see Alabama)  
 Christie, N., 17, 20  
 Classical Criminal Theory (see Theories)  
 Clear, T. R., 8, 20  
 Clinton, President William Jefferson, 3, 34, 83, 92, 104  
     Crime Prevention Bill, 92  
 Closed-ended questions, 133  
 Cohort, 139  
 Cole, G. F., 8, 20  
 Community-based programs (see Programs)  
 Community resources, 142  
 Conservative Approach (see Approaches)  
 Conditions of parole, 137  
 Conditions of release, 133  
 Conservatives, 11, 49, 83, 121  
 Confinement, 121  
 Costs, 13  
 Controlled environment, 14



- (also see Milieu Therapy)
- Correctional Facility, 121
- Correctional guards, 133
- Correctional Officers (see Alabama)
- Correctional Offices (see Disciplinary Rehabilitation Unit)
- Correctional practices, 134
- Cost-effective, 137
- Counseling, 25, 52, 53
  - (also see Courts Regimented Intensive Probation Program)
  - AIDS, 53
  - Alcohol, 59
  - Drug, 59
  - Group, 3, 12, 112, 119, 139
  - HIV, 53
  - Individual, 3, 12, 112, 119, 140
  - Services, 100
- Court order, 121
- Courts Regimented Intensive Probation Program, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 82, 83, 87, 89, 90, 91, 92, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 137
  - AIDS Awareness, 53
  - Command Sergeant Major, 69
  - Ceremonies, 70
  - Crimes
    - Drug, 58
    - Personal, 58
    - Property, 58
    - Traffic, 58
  - Demographic characteristics
    - Age, 55, 74, 81, 91, 116
    - Education, 55, 81
    - Gender, 55, 74
    - Offense, 55
    - Race, 55, 74
  - Drill Sergeant, 69
  - Duty Sergeant, 69
  - Graduates, 89, 111, 116
  - HIV test, 53
  - Main components, 80
    - Ceremonies, 70

- Disciplinary, 70
- Group counseling, 70, 72
- Individual counseling, 70, 72
- Life skills training, 70
- Marching, 70
- Military drills, 70
- Physical training, 70, 71
- Substance abuse treatment, 70, 72
- Working, 70, 71
- Military-style training, 60
- Offenders, 80
- Parolees, 89
- Participants, 72, 89, 116
  - Characteristics, 54
- Phase One, 72
- Phase Two, 72
- Probationers, 89
- Recidivism rates, 112
- Services, 53
- Traffic violations, 61
- Cox, Louis, 3
- Crime Prevention Bill (see Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994)
- Criminal history, 9, 36, 126, 134
- Criminal justice arsenal, 131
- Criminal Justice Newsletter, 51, 64, 81, 82, 86, 104, 108
- Criminal Justice Policy Council, 59, 64, 91, 96, 138
  - (also see Texas)
- Criminal justice system, 2, 122
- Criminals
  - Career, 126
- Criminal personality, 134
- Criminogenic factors, 142
- Crimes
  - Drug, 58, 61
  - Personal, 58, 61
  - Property, 58, 61
  - Traffic, 58
- CRIPP (see Courts Regimented Intensive Probation Program)
- CTF (see U. S. Army Correctional Training Facility)

Cuvelier, S., J., 33, 34, 41, 44, 45, 49, 56, 58, 59, 62, 63

## D

Dagin, D., 17, 21

Delinquency, 10, 126

Demographic characteristics (see Disciplinary Rehabilitation Unit)  
(also see Courts Regimented Intensive Probation Program)

Department of

Central Records (see Alabama)

Corrections (see Alabama)

Corrections Central Records (see Alabama)

Corrections Files (see Alabama)

Probation (see Harris County, Texas)

Criminal Justice - Institutional Division (see Texas)

Determinism (see Theories)

Deterrence, 12, 67, 87, 126

Effects of, 17, 67

General, 16

Specific, 16

Deviant behavior, 8

Disciplinary Rehabilitation Unit, 4, 26, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 43,  
116, 117, 118, 131, 134

Background characteristics, 39

Education, 39

Gender, 39

Occupation, 39

Offense, 39

Race, 39

Components

Alcohol treatment, 36

Discipline, 36

Drug treatment, 36

Group counseling, 36, 38

Hard work, 36, 38

Individual counseling, 36, 38

Marching, 36, 38

Physical training, 36, 38

Twelve-Steps, 36

Correctional officers, 36

- Officials, 37
- Parolees, 42
- Participants, 42
- Phase One, 36
- Phase Three, 18
- Phase Two, 37, 38
- Probationers, 42
- Self-Discovery, 37, 136
- Twelve-Steps, 37, 119
- Discipline, 3, 9, 11, 127
  - Military-style, 25
  - Strict, 14, 124
- District of Columbia, 33
- Diversions, 18, 49, 77, 105, 111, 122
  - Boot camps, 49, 97
  - Community-based programs, 97
  - Electronic monitoring, 49, 97
  - House arrest, 49, 97
  - Intermediate programs, 49
  - Intensive Probation Supervision, 49, 97
- Drill instructors, 134
- Drill sergeants, 3
- DRU (see Disciplinary Rehabilitation Unit)
- Drug(s), 28, 118
  - Counseling, 56, 59
  - Data, 131
  - Random testing, 73
  - Self-reported use, 28
  - Use, 2, 29, 59, 113, 122
  - Use history, 25, 28, 131
  - Users, 4
- Drug treatment (see Programs)
- Drug use (see Drugs)
- Drug users (see Drugs)
- Durham, A., 18, 20
- Dysfunctional communities, 142
- Dyson, L., 33, 34, 44, 49, 81, 82, 84, 97, 98, 99, 106, 107

**E**

Education (see Probation Outcomes)  
 Electronic monitoring, 1, 18, 101, 122  
     (also see Diversions)  
 Ellis, J., 9, 23  
 Elmira, New York, 7  
 Elmira Reformatory, 7, 127  
 Employment (see Life Skills)  
 Eskridge, C. W., 97, 107  
 Extra legal variables, 141  
 Eysenck, Hans, 14, 20  
 Extra duty, 14

**F**

Facilities, 50  
 Fail, 141  
 Failures, 27, 28, 30, 39  
 Family relationship instructions (see Life Skills)  
 Federal Bureau of Prisons, 33  
 Felonies, 68, 90, 113, 114, 115, 116  
 Fiftal, L., 41, 44, 50, 56, 58, 59, 62, 63  
 Finckenauer, J. O., 10, 21  
 First-time offenders (see Offenders)  
 Florida, 51  
 Flowers, F. J., 39, 44  
 Formal evaluations, 134  
 Formal imprisonment (see Imprisonment)  
 Fort McClellan, Alabama (see Alabama)  
 Foucault, M., 16, 21  
 Frelander, D., 33, 44, 50, 62  
 Free will, 35, 127

**G**

GED (see General Equivalency Diploma)  
 General Equivalency Diploma, 3, 13, 107, 105, 112, 118, 127  
 Georgia, 2, 12, 98

## Gender

- (also see Courts Regimented Intensive Probation Program)
- General deterrence (see Deterrence)
- "Get tough" (see Approaches)
- Gonzales, D., 51, 64
- Gordon, D., 52, 63
- Gottfredson, M., 14, 21, 63, 81, 85
- Gould, L., 51, 63
- Gowdy, V. B., 104, 108
- Graduates, 27, 98, 102, 120
- Grande, P., 441, 44
- Grasmick, H., 17, 20, 21
- Group counseling (see Counseling)
- Guenther, R., 9, 21

## H

- Halfway house residents, 8
- Hagan, F. E., 39, 44, 56, 63
- Hair, J., 90, 95
- Hans Eysenck (see Operant Conditioning)
- Hard work, 9
- Hardened criminals, 1, 3, 5, 13, 122, 134
- Harland, A., 9, 21
- Harris County, Texas, 57, 91, 93, 120
  - Department of Criminal Justice - Institutional Division, 57
  - Department of Probation, 52, 53
  - Lifestyle Survey, 54, 56, 138
  - Sheriff's Department, 53, 68, 69, 140
- Hayeslip, D. W., 34, 45, 52, 59, 63, 83, 85, 92, 95, 104, 107
- Herrnstein, R. J., 60, 64, 81, 86
- Hill, M., 67, 84, 98, 100, 101, 102, 103
- Hirschi, T., 14, 21, 60, 63, 81, 85
- History
  - Self-reported, 28, 132
- HIV (see Counseling)
- Holman, J. E., 13, 14
- House arrest, 1, 122
  - (also see Diversions)

Hunter, R. J., 33, 34, 41, 44, 45, 49, 52, 53, 56, 58, 59, 62, 63, 69, 70,  
71, 85, 99, 107  
Huntsville, Texas, 56

## I

Illinois, 102, 103, 105  
Illinois Department of Corrections, 103, 108  
Imprisonment  
    Alternative to long-term, 67  
    Formal, 17  
    Long-term, 67  
    Pains of, 128  
    Traditional, 1, 33, 125  
    Traditional goals, 17  
Incarceration  
    Alternatives to, 133  
    Long-term, 1, 123  
    Traditional forms of, 25  
        Alternatives, 25  
Incapacitation, 17  
Inciardi, J. A., 28, 31  
Inmate labor, 127  
Intensive basic training (see Training)  
Intensive Probation Supervision (see Programs)  
Intensive supervision, 51, 100  
Intermediate programs (see Diversions)  
Intermediate sanction programs (see Programs)  
Individual counseling (see Counseling)  
Iowa, 8

## J

JIMS (see Justice Information Management System)  
Jones, M., 98, 102, 103, 104, 107  
Johnson, B. D., 10, 20  
Justice Information Management System, 54, 57, 61, 75, 82, 88, 127  
    Access to  
        Dates, 57  
        Jail sentences, 57

- New arrests, 57
- New convictions, 57
- Sentences to the Texas prison system, 57
- Technical violations, 57
- Judicial officer, 123
- Juvenile Awareness Programs, 10
  - (also see Scared Straight)
- Juvenile delinquent, 127

## K

- Kentucky, 8, 9
- Kilby Correctional Facility, 26, 28, 34, 134
- Klepper, S., 17, 21
- Kozuh, J., 9, 21

## L

- Lambert, C., 41, 45
- Laub, J. H., 86, 86
- Law and Order, 140
- Leadership, 11
- Learning by Association (see Operant Conditioning)
- Liberal approach (see Approaches)
- Liberals, 3, 49, 83, 123
- Life skills, 29, 53, 73
  - (also see Twelve-Steps)
  - Basic literacy, 73
  - Employment, 73
  - Family relationship instructions, 73
  - Personal relationship instruction, 73
  - Social training, 73
  - Stress reduction, 73
- Life Skills Training (see Training)
- Lima, J. M., 8, 11, 21
- Long-term incarceration (see Incarceration)
- Low self-control, 128
- Lundman, R. L., 10, 21



**M**

- McCord, W., 14, 22
- MMPI (see Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory)
- MacKenzie, D. L., 12, 21, 25, 31, 33, 34, 41, 45, 49, 51, 52, 56, 59, 63, 65, 85, 87, 89, 92, 93, 95, 96, 99, 104, 108
- Mandatory sentences, 2
- Marching, 140
- Marquart, J. W., 33, 34, 41, 44, 45, 49, 56, 58, 59, 62, 63
- Martin, R., 13, 14, 21
- Martinson, Robert, 3
- Maryland, 102, 103, 105
- Massachusetts, 74
- Mathias, R., 26, 31
- Mathiesen, T., 89, 96
- Matthews, J., 26, 31
- Milieu Therapy (see Therapy)
- Military
  - Approach, 12
  - Boot camps, 50
  - Basic training, 11, 67
  - Ceremonies, 70, 128
  - Drills, 70
  - Punishment, 14
  - Structure, 128
  - Style discipline (see Discipline)
  - Training, 5
  - Training approach (see Approaches)
- Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, 36, 134
- Misdemeanors, 90, 91, 114, 115,
- Morash, 10, 14, 15, 23, 67, 85
- Morris, N., 74, 85
- Motivation, 11
- Murray, Charles, 3
- Mutchnick, R. J., 13, 14, 21

**N**

- NA (see Narcotics Anonymous)
- Nachmias, C. F., 39, 45

Nachmias, D., 39, 45  
 Narcotics Anonymous, 13, 36, 37, 101, 128  
 National Institute of Justice, 12  
 Nets of incarceration, 25, 131  
 Net-widening, 1, 8, 52, 119, 123  
 New Hampshire, 102, 103, 105  
 New Jersey, 10  
 New Mexico, 12  
 New York, 51, 74, 104  
 New Zealand, 8, 9  
 New Zealand Corrective Training Program (see Programs)  
     Discipline, 9  
     Hard work, 9  
     Physical fitness, 9  
 Non-Recidivists, 80  
 Nonviolent offender (see Offender)  
 Nonviolent offense (see Offense)  
 Nonviolent criminal activities, 98  
 No fail, 141  
 Normal sentence (see Sentences)

## O

Offenders, 4, 15, 36, 38, 98, 100, 101, 111, 112, 115, 118, 123  
     Behavior, 58  
     Criminal history, 9  
     First-time, 9, 26, 50, 98, 131  
     Groups, 131  
     Non-violent, 26, 40, 131  
     Populations, 128  
     Risk assessment, 88, 141  
     Self-control, 15  
     Self-discipline, 15  
  
 Offense  
     Drug use, 91  
     Drug, 4, 82  
     Limitations, 12  
     Nonviolent, 13  
     Personal, 4, 82

Prior, 141

Property, 4, 8, 82

Traffic, 82

Types of, 4, 90

    Personal, 90, 116

    Drug, 90, 116

    Misdemeanors, 90, 116

Ohio, 8

Oklahoma, 2, 12

Open-ended responses, 135

Operant Conditioning (see Theories)

Overcrowding, 1, 25, 29, 36, 51, 52, 68, 80, 87, 93, 97, 99, 104, 111, 117, 124

    Alternative strategies, 87

## P

Pains of imprisonment, 10, 52

    Deprivation of

        Autonomy, 52

        Goods and services, 52

        Heterosexual relationships, 52

        Liberty, 52

        Security, 52

Paramilitary training (see Training)

Parent, D. G., 12, 22, 25, 31, 45, 50, 51, 67, 85, 87, 89, 93, 96, 98, 99, 108

Park, E., 9, 20

Participants, 3, 34

    (also see Disciplinary Rehabilitation Unit and Courts Regimented Intensive Probation Program)

Parolees, 101, 111, 114

    (also see Courts Regimented Intensive Probation Program)

Paternoster, R., 17, 22

Personal development, 135

Personal relationship instruction (see Life Skills)

Petersilia, J., 22

Phase One

    Criminal history, 36

    (see Aftercare, Disciplinary Rehabilitation Unit and Courts

- Regimented Intensive Probation Program)
- Phase Three
  - (see Aftercare, Disciplinary Rehabilitation Unit)
- Phase Two
  - (see Aftercare, Self-Discovery, Disciplinary Rehabilitation Unit and Courts Regimented Intensive Probation Program)
- Physical fitness, 9, 11
- Physical training (see Training)
- Plattsmier, R., 9, 21
- Plea bargain, 131
- Positivism (see Theories)
- Post-release adjustment, 89, 138
- Post-release supervision, 135
- Pre-release training (see Training)
- Pre-sentence reports, 132
- Predictors of Recidivism (see Recidivism)
- Prejean, R., 41, 44
- President Bill Clinton (see William Jefferson Clinton)
- Prevention, 129
- Prior offenses (see Offenses)
- Prison, 123
- Probation, 52, 82, 101, 128
  - Adult, 125
  - Conditions of, 68, 100
  - Outcomes
    - Education, 8
    - Marital status, 8
    - Prior record, 8
  - Regular, 1, 8, 73
  - Shock, 8, 9, 10, 12, 130
  - Super intensive, 1, 54
  - Supervision, 128
- Probationer, 9, 53, 54, 60, 69, 100, 114
  - (also see Courts Regimented Intensive Probation Program)
  - Regular, 8, 111, 112, 129
  - Shock, 8, 9, 130
- Problem-solving techniques, 135
- Program(s)
  - Adult education, 50

- Alcohol treatment, 13
- Barracks, 69
- Boot camps, 3, 33
- Community-based, 97
- Community supervision, 1, 121
- Completion, 132
- Conservation camp, 26
- Correctional, 12, 98
  - Discipline, 12
  - Hard work, 12
  - Marching, 12
  - Physical training, 12
- Counseling, 50, 69
- Disciplinary, 26
- Drug treatment, 13
- Electronic monitoring, 18
- Failure, 80, 132
- Intermediate sanction, 1, 2, 49, 93, 97, 104, 122
- Intensive probation supervision, 18, 138
  - (also see diversions)
- Medical, 69
- New Zealand Corrective Training, 9
- Rehabilitation, 2, 26
- Sanctions, 17
- Scared Straight, 68
- Self-Help Counseling, 136
- Self-Help programs, 141
- Sentencing Alternative Intensive, 68, 140
- Shock incarceration, 50, 67, 80, 93, 99, 101, 103, 104, 105, 111, 116, 136
- Shock probation, 9, 68
- Short-term, 124
- Substance abuse treatment, 72, 100, 132, 140
- Super Intensive Probation, 54, 60, 61, 82, 92, 125, 137
  - Requirements, 92
- Therapeutic Rehabilitative Treatment, 112
- Treatment, 2, 17
- Treatment-oriented, 113
- Training, 17
- Vocational, 69

Property offenses (see Offenses)  
 Public Law (see Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994)  
 Punishment, 3, 12, 16, 17, 18, 49, 87, 98  
     Severe, 124  
     Traditional goals of, 17  
 Punitive treatment approach (see Approaches)  
 Punitive Model, 124  
 Push-ups, 14

## Q

Questionnaires, 26, 133  
     (also see boot camp)  
 Quinn, J. F., 13, 14, 21

## R

Rahway Prison, 10, 128  
 Random drug testing, 143  
 Ratiff, B., 33, 45, 50, 64  
 Rational choice, 135  
 Rational Choice Theory (see Theories)  
 Readjustment, 143  
 Reagan, Ronald, 2  
 Reality Therapy (see Therapy)  
 Rearrest, 89, 103, 129  
 Recidivists, 80  
 Recidivism, 3, 8, 9, 15, 42, 54, 73, 74, 80, 87, 88, 89, 90, 93, 98, 103, 105, 111, 124  
     Age, 81  
     Assessment, 73  
     Criminal factors shaping, 73  
     Gender, 74  
     Levels, 4, 34, 50, 58, 81, 88, 102  
     Level of education, 78  
     Marital status, 76  
     Offenses after CRIPP, 82  
     Predictors of, 8, 74, 116  
         Age, 8

- Marital status, 8
- Prior record, 8
- Race, 76
- Rate of, 59, 99
- Type of offense, 79
- Reconviction, 129
- Reform, 129
- Regular probation (see Probation)
- Regular probationers (see Probationers and Courts Regimented Intensive Probation Program))
- Regular supervision, 100
- Rehabilitation, 12, 17, 26, 67, 87, 124
  - Effects on, 67
  - Programs (see Programs)
- Rehabilitation Training Instructors Course, 11
  - (also see Alabama)
- Reichers, L., 51, 63
- Reincarceration, 130
- Releasees, 101
- Research and Evaluation Division, 10, 11, 22
- Research Monitoring and Evaluation Office (see Alabama)
- Responsibility, 3
- Restitution, 17
- Retribution, 17
- Revocation, 143
- Ribner, S. A., 74, 85
- Rigorous physical labor, 136
- RTIC (see Rehabilitation Training Instructors Course)
- Rucker, L., 67, 85

## S

- SAIP (see Sentencing Alternative Intensive Program)
- Sam Houston State University, 56
- Samaha, J., 74, 85
- Samenow, S. E., 15, 22, 23, 35, 45
- Sampson, R. J., 80, 86
- Sanchez, J., 14, 22
- Sanctions, 17
- "Scared Straight", 8, 9, 10, 130

- (also see Programs and Juvenile Awareness Project)
- Self-Discipline, 14, 15, 136
- Self-Discovery (see Disciplinary Rehabilitation Unit)
- Self-Help Counseling Program (see Programs)
- Senate Bill 245, 68
- Sentences
  - Normal, 30
  - Strict mandatory, 125
- Sentencing Alternative Intensive Program
  - (see Programs)
- Serok, S., 15, 22
- Shaw, J., 25, 31, 34, 41, 45, 49, 51, 56, 59, 63, 92, 96, 104, 108
- Shock incarceration, 33, 42, 51, 97, 98, 99
  - (also see Programs)
  - Completion, 27
  - Failure, 27
  - Outcome, 25
  - Short-term, 25
- Shock probation (see Probation)
- Shock probation programs (see Programs)
- Shock probationers (see Probationers)
- Short-term programs (see Programs)
- SIPP (see Super Intensive Probation Program)
- Six Programmatic Areas, 56, 138
- Slavson, S. R., 14, 22
- Smith, B. A., 7, 22
- Social training (see Life Skills)
- Socially disorganized neighborhoods
  - Characteristics, 99
- Souryal, C., 65, 85, 92, 96
- Specific deterrence (see Deterrence)
- Steadman, 74, 85
- Stockade confinement, 10
- Stress reduction (see Life Skills)
- Strict military discipline (see Boot Camps)
- Strict discipline (see Discipline)
- Substance abuse treatment (see Programs)
- Super Intensive Probation (see Probation, Programs)
- Survey, 30, 57
  - Adult Probation Commission's Statistical, 9



Harris County Lifestyle (also see Harris County)

Six-item, 41, 54

Sykes, G., 50, 52, 64, 89, 96, 98, 108

## T

Tatham, R., 90, 95

TDCJ - ID (see Teas Department of Criminal Justice - Institutional Division)

Texas, 4, 8, 9, 52, 80, 81, 87, 88, 114, 117

(also see Courts Regimented Intensive Probation Program)

Boot camp program, 68, 70, 82

Criminal Justice Policy Council (see entry)

Criminal justice system, 83

Department of Criminal Justice - Institutional Division, 57, 59, 68, 73, 80, 88, 113, 141

Prison system, 57, 71

Therapeutic Rehabilitation Treatment (see Programs)

Therapy, 105

Activity, 15, 125

Milieu, 14

Reality, 11, 15, 129

Theoretical Treatment Approaches (see Approaches)

Theories

Beccaria, 13

Classical criminology, 13, 126

Determinism, 13, 126

Hans Eysenck (see Operant Conditioning)

Operant conditioning, 14, 128

Positivism, 13, 14, 128

Rational Choice, 35, 129, 136

Thompson, R. D., 8, 22

Tonry, M., 74, 85

Traditional correctional facilities (see Facilities)

Traditional goals of imprisonment (see Imprisonment)

Traditional imprisonment, 33, 111

(also see Imprisonment)

Traditional incarceration, 3, 26, 89

Alternatives to, 18, 98, 111

Training

- Intensive basic, 127
- Life skill, 140
- Military, 5
- Military basic, 67
- Paramilitary, 54
- Physical, 15, 37, 140
- Pre-Release, 135
- Treatment, 3, 49, 114, 125
  - (also see Programs)
- Treatment Approaches, 10
  - Behavioral contacts, 11
  - Individual counseling, 11
  - Group counseling, 11
  - Reality therapy, 11
- Trojanowicz, R. C., 10, 14, 15, 23
- Turque, B, 51, 64
- Turnbull, B. W., 8, 20
- Twelve-Steps
  - (see Approaches, Alcoholics Anonymous and Disciplinary Rehabilitation Unit)

## U

- USARB (see U.S. Army Retraining Brigade)
- U.S. Army, 7
  - Correctional Training Facility, 10, 130
  - Military Police School, 11, 126
  - Retraining Brigade, 10, 11, 130
  - Standards, 10
- U. S. Department of Justice, 73

## V

- Victimization, 81
- Vietnam War, 10
- Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, 34, 45, 83, 85, 104, 108, 137
- Virginia, 10
- Vito, G. F., 8, 9, 23, 33, 44, 51, 62, 81, 84, 98, 99, 107
- Vold, G. B., 13, 14

168

Von Hirsch, A., 18, 23

## W

Wallerstedt, J. F., 73, 74, 86

Washouts, 26, 132

Web of Social Control, 52

Welborn, J., 25, 31

Wilson, James Q., 3, 16, 23, 60, 64, 81, 86

Women, 74

Work, 141

World War I, 7

World War II, 7

## Y

Yates Law, 7, 130

Yochelson, S., 15, 23, 35, 45

Yurkanin, A., 25, 31, 33, 45, 104, 108

PROPERTY OF  
National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)  
Box 6000  
Rockville, MD 20849-6000

## About the Authors

**James F. Anderson** is an Associate Professor at Eastern Kentucky University, Department of Police Studies. He received a Ph.D. in Criminal Justice at Sam Houston State University and a M.Sc. from Alabama State University in Criminology. He is published in over fifteen criminal justice outlets. He has been a Doctoral Research Fellow at the National Institute of Justice and is presently conducting research on boot camps and health issues among incarcerated populations.

**Laronistine Dyson** is Associate Director of Admission at Kentucky State University. She received a Master's degree from Bowling Green State University. She has co-authored over eighteen scholarly articles in the area of boot camps; public health care; gangs; jail suicides; correctional managers' leadership styles; police liability; psychology; and others. She recently completed participation in a project conducted on the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections.

**Jerald C. Burns** is a Professor and Chair of the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice at Alabama State University. He received a Master's degree in criminology from Sam Houston State University and a doctorate in Public Administration from the University of Alabama. He is published in Federal Probation, Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, Journal of Offender Monitoring, and other criminal justice outlets. He is currently researching homicides in Montgomery, Alabama.

