

(RE)CONCEPTUALIZING THE POTENTIAL OF TRANSFORMATION: FROM CORRECTIONS-BASED BOOT CAMPS AS SITES OF DISCIPLINE TO SITES OF TREATMENT.

Wm. Dustin Cantrell, PhD

Illinois Association for Behavioral Health

2017

METHODS

- Literature Review
- Interviews with Boot Camp Staff
 - Security Staff
 - Treatment Staff
- Pre/Post- Test Data Analysis

WHAT IS A “BOOT CAMP?”

‘As the name implies, correctional boot camps are in-prison programs that resemble military basic training. They emphasize vigorous physical activity, manual labor, and other activities that ensure that participants have little, if any, free time. Strict rules govern all aspects of conduct and appearance. Correctional officers act as drill instructors, initially using intense verbal tactics designed to break down inmates’ resistance and lead to constructive changes.’ (NIJ, 2003)

WHAT IS A “BOOT CAMP?”

‘As soon as the offender enters the program we begin to break them down. We are attempting to replace their old ideologies with a vision of a new path for them in their lives. We offer the offenders a very structured and scheduled environment. We keep them busy hour to hour. We provide them programming and treatment. We focus on teaching them the value of helping others and the reward of working hard.’ – Henry Simpson

WHEN DID CORRECTIONS-BASE BOOT CAMP BEGIN?

“Correctional boot camps first appeared in the United States in the early 1980s in Georgia and Oklahoma. A successor to the “shock probation” and “scared straight” programs from the 1960s and 1970s, boot camps were initially based on the premise that military regimentation, strict discipline, and strenuous physical activity could jolt offenders into reforming their criminal ways. Moreover, by providing early release o program graduates, boot camps were also conceptualized as a means to help alleviate the problem of prison overcrowding.” (Duwe andKerschner, 2008)

WHY ARE BOOT CAMPS SO POPULAR?

“Boot camps were marketed with extravagant claims based on ideological and political ideas rather than on empirically established practices. Conservatives believed boot camps provided a secure facility where inmates were forced to deal with the harsh consequences of crime, and they would learn self-control through regimented military training and hard labor. Liberals believed the same programs offered education and rehabilitation that provided opportunities for conventional living. Boot camps were sold as the ideal solution to the problem of how to incarcerate a large number of offenders for punishment as well as rehabilitation.” (Benda, Toombs, and Peacock, 2006)

WHY ARE BOOT CAMPS SO POPULAR?

“Rarely has a public policy initiative been ushered into practice with such exalted fanfare, widespread support, and hopeful anticipation. Boot camps are conceptually appealing to an impressively broad-based variety of stakeholders, ranging across the political spectrum from liberals to conservatives; from veterans to civilians; from judges to public defenders.” (Stinchcomb, 2005)

EVOLUTION OF THE MODEL

- First Generation
 - Short Duration
 - Focus on Strict Military Discipline; Physical Training; and Manual Labor
- Second Generation
 - Generally Longer Duration
 - Begin to Shift to Therapeutic Programming
- Third Generation
 - Balanced Physical Training and Therapeutic Programming
 - Emphasize Pre-Release/Reentry Planning

EVOLUTION OF THE MODEL

“Although the public is unlikely to be widely cognizant of such prevailing juvenile justice initiatives as anger management, conflict resolution, or family group conferencing, the same level of obscurity does not protect boot camps. To the contrary, boot camps emerged under the bright spotlight of instant celebrity status and have since continued to remain in the public’s eye.” (Stinchcomb, 2005)

DO BOOT CAMPS WORK?

DO BOOT CAMPS WORK?

“Success and failure can be variously defined depending on the frame of reference.” (Benda, Toombs, and Peacock, 2006)

DO BOOT CAMPS WORK?: RECIDIVISM DEFINED

‘Many of the early boot camp evaluations were conducted by the Departments of Corrections in the states that first established these alternative correctional programs: Georgia; Florida; and New York. Evaluations in all three states used **return to prison as the recidivism measure** and offenders sentenced to prison as a comparison group.’
(Kempinen and Kurlychek, 2003)

DO BOOT CAMPS WORK?: RECIDIVISM DEFINED

“Recidivism was operationalized as a **rearrest**, a **felony revocation**, a **return to prison** for a **new criminal offense** (i.e., **reimprisonment**), and any **return to prison** (i.e., **reincarceration** because of a **new crime or technical violation**).” (Duwe and Kerschner, 2008)

DO BOOT CAMPS WORK?: RECIDIVISM DEFINED

‘In sum, although studies examining the effectiveness of adult boot camps in reducing crime have resulted in inconsistent findings, many of the differences are attributable to variations in: measuring recidivism (e.g., parole violations, arrest, convictions, return to prison), comparison groups (boot camp drop outs, probationers, persons realeased from prison), length of tracking time (ranging from 12 months to 5 years), use of control variables, and program type (quasi-military vs. rehabilitative).’ (Kempinen and Kurlychek, 2003)

DO BOOT CAMPS WORK?: RECIDIVISM MEASURED

“In an early study of Louisiana’s boot camp, Mackenzie found no difference in the rearrest rates of offenders sentenced to prison, probation, or boot camp (MacKenzie, 1991).” (Kempinen and Kurlychek, 2003)

DO BOOT CAMPS WORK?: RECIDIVISM MEASURED

“In general, few studies found significant differences between the groups in recidivism. Out of the total of 43 studies (2005-Campbell Collaboration), only five studies found significant differences between the groups in favor of the boot camp and only four studies found significant differences in favor of the comparison group.” (MacKenzie, Bierie, and Mitchell, 2007)

DO BOOT CAMPS WORK?: RECIDIVISM MEASURED

“In summary, the research on recidivism and correctional boot camps has not shown evidence of the effectiveness in reducing recidivism. However, the research suffers from several problems that make conclusions about the ineffectiveness of boot camps questionable. “(MacKenzie, Bierie, and Mitchell, 2007)

DO BOOT CAMPS WORK?: RECIDIVISM MEASURED

‘Furthermore, although this study focused on the success of the boot camp in reducing recidivism, it is worth noting that the boot camp does help alleviate prison overcrowding and this is a cost-saving program. In Pennsylvania, the boot camp reduces an offender’s sentence, on average, by 1 year. As the recidivism rates of boot camp offenders are comparable to those of offenders going to prison, it can be argued that it is a fiscally successful program that does not result in increased risk to society.’ (Kempinen and Kurlychek, 2003)

DO BOOT CAMPS WORK?: RECIDIVISM MEASURED

“Concentrating merely on whether offenders are rearrested, reconvicted, or reincarcerated following release is often the benchmark used in correctional program evaluations because it is, generally speaking, an easier and more feasible issue to address analytically. But results can vary significantly depending on how one measures recidivism. Moreover, even if multiple measures of recidivism are used, the issue of whether offenders recidivate does not tell the full story about whether a correctional program works.” (Duwe and Kerschner, 2008)

DO BOOT CAMPS WORK?: MORE THAN RECIDIVISM

“It’s not only to reduce recidivism, but increase life skills. It’s not just about having them stay out of prison, but about helping improve their lives. We are teaching them foundational skills - respect for community; the value of hard work; personal responsibility; and self-discipline.” – Sarah Henderson

DO BOOT CAMPS WORK?: MORE THAN RECIDIVISM

“I want them to be more informed about the choices they are making around the use of drugs and alcohol. I want them to see the consequences of their actions. I want them to see that there is a way out of the kind of lives they are living and then give them tools to do it.” – Jessica Caden

DO BOOT CAMPS WORK?: ADDRESSING CRIMINOGENIC NEEDS

“Procriminal or antisocial attitudes have consistently shown significant associations with adult criminal behavior. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that changes in attitudes and impulses may precede future changes in behavior. Therapeutic programs that lead to these changes would be expected to have an impact on offenders’ future criminal activities.”
(MacKenzie, Bierie, and Mitchell, 2007)

DO BOOT CAMPS WORK?: ADDRESSING CRIMINOGENIC NEEDS

“Research suggests that some of the most prominent criminogenic factors that should be addressed in a program include antisocial attitudes; problems in work , school, and the home; drug and alcohol abuse; and association with antisocial/criminal others... Other research expands the concept of need to include additional social risk factors such as low self-esteem and emotional/psychological problems that may impair social functioning but have not been found by research to directly lead to criminal activity (Dowden and Andrews, 2000).” (Kempinen and Kurlychek, 2003)

DO BOOT CAMPS WORK?: ADDRESSING CRIMINOGENIC NEEDS

“Criminal theory and prior research has established that such antisocial attitudes are strongly related to criminal conduct and recidivism. In fact, Gendreau and colleagues found that the strongest predictor of recidivism was ‘criminal needs,’ a concept that included antisocial attitudes.” (Mitchell, Mackenzie, and Perez, 2005)



WestCare is a family of tax-exempt nonprofit organizations spanning nineteen states and four U.S. Territories. We provide a wide spectrum of health and human services in both residential and outpatient environments. Our services include substance abuse and addiction treatment, homeless and runaway shelters, domestic violence treatment and prevention, and mental health programs.



Services are available to adults, children, adolescents, and families; we specialize in helping people traditionally considered difficult to treat, such as those who are indigent, have multiple disorders, or are involved with the criminal justice system.



Boot Camps: Dixon Springs IIP and Du Quoin IIP

DU QUOIN AND DIXON SPRINGS IIP

- Focus: Dixon Springs and Du Quoin are Impact Incarceration Program. Often referred to as “boot camps,” these programs operate under the behavioral modification philosophy. This is a pre-sentencing program through which successful clients have their sentencing reduced to time served. The overall program length is 120 days during which WestCare acts as an adjunct by providing CBT and Specialty Groups. Dixon Springs has both Men and Women’s programming.
- Specialty Groups: Re-Entry Group, Motherhood, Fatherhood, and SAMHSA Anger Management
- Assessments: ASI (Criminal); CBT Inventory; TCU Battery; WestCare DSM-5; Client Satisfaction Survey

DU QUOIN AND DIXON SPRINGS IIP: TREATMENT STRUCTURE

“The process begins, not at the boot camp itself, but as soon as the offender volunteers for the program – whether they volunteer for a recognized need or for the time cut – they have decided to take on the challenge.” – Henry Simpson

DU QUOIN AND DIXON SPRINGS IIP: TREATMENT STRUCTURE

- Orientation:
 - First 2 weeks – “Ghosts”
 - Learning Schedule, Rules, Policies and Procedures, and Drills for Boot Camp.
 - Receiving Work Assignments.
 - Treatment – Assessments, Basic Orientation
- Mainstreamed:
 - 10 Weeks of CBT, Drug Education, and Specialty Groups (Fatherhood, Motherhood, SAMHSA Anger Management, Seeking Safety)
- Reentry:
 - Final 3 weeks
 - Reentry Planning, Setting Goals, Develop Strategies for dealing with challenges, making referrals for further services.
- Post-Release:
 - Follow up with clients and/or service provider to confirm if appointment was met, rescheduled, or missed

DU QUOIN AND DIXON SPRINGS IIP: INTEGRATED APPROACH TO TREATMENT

“There is a traditional split between security staff - who focus on control and safety - and the treatment staff - who help identify and address issues in the offenders’ lives. Recently we have seen the two starting to merge. We see security staff and even shift commanders sitting in on treatment groups. We are all working together to help the inmates succeed.” - Henry Simpson

“My favorite group is the “Fatherhood” group. Being a father is the most important role I have in my life. I can go into that group and help talk through whatever topic is in the curriculum that day. I listen to the group participants and we all leave seeing each other in a different light.” – Henry Simpson

DU QUOIN AND DIXON SPRINGS IIP: INTEGRATED APPROACH TO TREATMENT

“Here there is a lot of opportunity for offenders to learn about themselves and the issues they face. Over all, the programing is much better. We get the opportunity to get to know them and help them through the issues that got them there. We get to do mentoring instead of just housing them like in other DOC camps.” – Oscar Maddox

“I sit in on some of the sessions and learn what the offenders are learning. Later, when talking with the offenders, we have a common language we can use to address any issues.” – Oscar Maddox

DU QUOIN AND DIXON SPRINGS IIP: DOES IT WORK?

“I would say that 90% of our clients leave with a new set of goals and definition of success. During orientation most guys talk about getting back out and using and dealing. They leave with new priorities – working and being responsible to their family. Their goals become prosocial.” – Sarah Henderson

“Personally, I like that when I go home at night I can say, ‘I really helped someone today.’ The offenders are different people when they leave here.” – Oscar Maddox

DU QUOIN AND DIXON SPRINGS IIP: DOES IT WORK?

“When I began my work experience at IIP I did not aspire to make a career out of providing treatment in a prison setting. My intentions were to gain experience in the substance abuse field, obtain my state certification and move on with my career. However after experiencing the program, I stayed because it became an opportunity for me to grow and understand the impact of that career. It became the career that I love.” – Jessica Caden

DOES THE WESTCARE APPROACH TO THERAPEUTIC BOOT CAMPS WORK? ASSESSMENT, MEASUREMENT, AND DATA ANALYSIS

Texas Christian University (TCU) Assessment Battery:

The TCU Treatment System includes interrelated assessments and manual-guided interventions that “target” specific client needs and their status in different stages of change during treatment. Evidence for these stages provides the foundation for the TCU Treatment Process Model ([Simpson, 2004; 2006](#)) and involves induction into treatment, engagement in treatment, early recovery in treatment, adequate retention before treatment release, and preparation for community reentry.

(<https://ibr.tcu.edu/overview/>)

ASSESSMENT, MEASUREMENT, AND DATA ANALYSIS

Texas Christian University (TCU) Assessment Forms:

TCU Criminal Thinking Scales (TCU CTSForm) include 36 items from 6 scales representing Entitlement, Justification, Power Orientation, Cold Heartedness, Criminal Rationalization, and Personal Irresponsibility (see [Knight, Garner, Simpson, Morey, & Flynn, 2006](#)).

TCU Treatment Needs and Motivation (TCU MOTForm) includes 36 items from 5 scales representing Problem Recognition, Desire for Help, Treatment Readiness, Treatment Needs Index, and Pressures for Treatment Index. It is used mainly for intake and early treatment phases.

ASSESSMENT, MEASUREMENT, AND DATA ANALYSIS

Texas Christian University (TCU) Assessment Forms:

TCU Psychological Functioning (TCU PSYForm) includes 33 items from 5 scales representing Depression, Anxiety, Self-Esteem, Decision Making, and Expectancy.

TCU Social Functioning (TCU SOCForm) includes 36 items from 4 scales representing Hostility, Risk-Taking, Social Support, and Social Desirability.

TCU Treatment Engagement (TCU ENGForm) includes 36 items from 4 scales representing Treatment Participation, Treatment Satisfaction, Counseling Rapport, and Peer Support.

TCU CRIMINAL THINKING SCALES (TCU CTSFORM) INCLUDE 36 ITEMS FROM 6 SCALES REPRESENTING ENTITLEMENT, JUSTIFICATION, POWER ORIENTATION, COLD HEARTEDNESS, CRIMINAL RATIONALIZATION, AND PERSONAL IRRESPONSIBILITY (SEE KNIGHT, GARNER, SIMPSON, MOREY, & FLYNN, 2006).

DuQuoin (n=121)

Variable Name	Score (Pre)	Score (Post)	Difference	Significance
Entitlement	20.51	15.85	- 4.66	<.001
Justification	22.89	18.00	- 4.89	<.001
Power Orientation	27.37	21.73	- 5.64	<.001
Cold Heartedness	23.31	22.07	- 1.24	.056
Criminal Rationalization	33.33	27.04	- 6.29	<.001
Personal Irresponsibility	24.20	18.69	- 5.51	<.001

TCU CRIMINAL THINKING SCALES (TCU CTSFORM) INCLUDE 36 ITEMS FROM 6 SCALES REPRESENTING ENTITLEMENT, JUSTIFICATION, POWER ORIENTATION, COLD HEARTEDNESS, CRIMINAL RATIONALIZATION, AND PERSONAL IRRESPONSIBILITY (SEE KNIGHT, GARNER, SIMPSON, MOREY, & FLYNN, 2006).

Dixon Springs (Female) (n=32)

Variable Name	Score (Pre)	Score (Post)	Difference	Significance
Entitlement	18.44	17.29	- 1.15	.07
Justification	23.33	19.84	- 3.49	.007
Power Orientation	24.11	22.54	- 1.56	.313
Cold Heartedness	19.69	19.88	0.19	.896
Criminal Rationalization	28.70	27.86	- 0.83	.437
Personal Irresponsibility	21.41	19.01	- 2.40	<.001

Dixon Springs (Male) (n=112)

Variable Name	Score (Pre)	Score (Post)	Difference	Significance
Entitlement	20.01	18.13	- 1.89	.003
Justification	22.97	19.94	- 3.03	<.001
Power Orientation	26.02	24.15	- 1.87	.007
Cold Heartedness	20.71	21.02	0.3	.574
Criminal Rationalization	31.85	29.66	- 2.19	.003
Personal Irresponsibility	23.35	20.34	- 3.01	<.000

**TCU PSYCHOLOGICAL FUNCTIONING (TCU PSYFORM)
INCLUDES 33 ITEMS FROM 5 SCALES
REPRESENTING DEPRESSION, ANXIETY, SELF-
ESTEEM, DECISION MAKING, AND EXPECTANCY.**

Du Quoin (n=121)

Variable	Score (Pre)	Score (Post)	Difference	Significance
Self-Esteem	34.70	40.00	5.29	<.001
Depression	23.80	19.20	- 4.60	<.001
Anxiety	30.43	23.00	- 7.45	<.001
Decision Making	35.24	39.27	4.03	<.001
Expectancy	38.10	42.71	4.61	<.001

TCU PSYCHOLOGICAL FUNCTIONING (TCU PSYFORM)

INCLUDES 33 ITEMS FROM 5 SCALES

REPRESENTING DEPRESSION, ANXIETY, SELF-ESTEEM, DECISION MAKING, AND EXPECTANCY.

Dixon Springs (Female) (n=33)

Variable	Score (Pre)	Score (Post)	Difference	Significance
Self-Esteem	30.76	38.59	7.83	<.000
Depression	29.80	22.83	- 6.97	<.000
Anxiety	34.20	26.84	- 7.36	<.000
Decision Making	32.43	37.99	5.26	<.000
Expectancy	33.41	37.27	3.86	.011

Dixon Springs (Male) (n=112)

Variable	Score (Pre)	Score (Post)	Difference	Significance
Self-Esteem	32.05	36.25	4.20	.269
Depression	25.99	23.02	- 2.96	.002
Anxiety	30.40	26.76	- 3.64	<.001
Decision Making	35.00	38.41	3.41	<.001
Expectancy	33.71	37.03	3.33	.004

TCU SOCIAL FUNCTIONING (TCU SOCFORM) INCLUDES 36 ITEMS FROM 4 SCALES REPRESENTING HOSTILITY, RISK-TAKING, SOCIAL SUPPORT, AND SOCIAL DESIRABILITY.

Du Quoin (n=121)

Variable	Score (Pre)	Score (Post)	Difference	Significance
Hostility	25.27	22.43	- 2.83	.008
Risk-Taking	34.36	29.50	- 4.86	<.001
Social Support	40.28	44.06	3.79	<.001

TCU SOCIAL FUNCTIONING (TCU SOCFORM) INCLUDES 36 ITEMS FROM 4 SCALES REPRESENTING HOSTILITY, RISK-TAKING, SOCIAL SUPPORT, AND SOCIAL DESIRABILITY.

Dixon Spr. (Female) (n= 33)

Variable	Score (Pre)	Score (Post)	Difference	Significance
Hostility	25.34	21.06	- 4.28	<.001
Risk-Taking	36.36	30.87	- 5.50	<.001
Social Support	41.21	42.90	1.68	.091

Dixon Spr. (Male) (n= 111)

Variable	Score (Pre)	Score (Post)	Difference	Significance
Hostility	26.49	23.60	- 2.89	.001
Risk-Taking	36.39	33.73	- 2.66	.001
Social Support	40.34	43.06	2.72	<.001

WESTCARE'S BOOT CAMP TREATMENT MODEL

Does it work?

THANK YOU!

Questions? Comments?