This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

The Antisocial Attitudes and The Attitudes Toward Boot Camp of Boot Camp Inmates: A Comparison of African Americans and Caucasian Americans

presented by

ASSANEE SANGKHANATE

has been accepted towards fulfillment of the requirements for

M.S. degree in Criminal Justice

Major professor

Date 12/20/1999

THE ANTISOCIAL ATTITUDES AND THE ATTITUDES TOWARD BOOT CAMP OF BOOT CAMP INMATES: A COMPARISON OF AFRICAN AMERICANS AND CAUCASIAN AMERICANS

By

Assanee Sangkhanate

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

School of Criminal Justice

1999

ABSTRACT

THE ANTISOCIAL ATTITUDES AND THE ATTITUDES TOWARD BOOT CAMP OF BOOT CAMP INMATES: A COMPARISON OF AFRICAN AMERICANS AND CAUCASIAN AMERICANS

By

Assanee Sangkhanate

The present study was designed to examine the antisocial attitudes and the attitudes toward boot camp program of boot camp participants. Specifically, the author intended to examine if Caucasian American and African American offenders changed their attitudes after graduating from the program. In addition, the study was conducted to examine if Caucasian American and African American offenders differed in their antisocial and program attitudes before and after participating in boot camp. Data were retrieved from the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) database. Samples of were randomly selected from boot camp offenders in South Carolina. The independent variables are socio-demographic and criminal characteristics of samples while scores from Antisocial Attitude Scale and Program Attitude Scale were used as dependent variables. Results show that Caucasian Americans became less antisocial and more positive about the program after they participating in boot camp; whereas, African Americans did not significantly change both attitudes over time. When examining the interaction between race and other characteristics, most predictors such as education, gender, and substance abuse history that were commonly used to look at effects of programs seem applicable only to Caucasians and did not predict anything much for African Americans.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to sincerely thank Dr. Sheila Maxwell, the Chairperson of the Thesis Committee. Her suggestions and assistance were invaluable. Also, I would like to deeply thank the other committee members, Dr. Vincent Hoffman and Dr. Charles Corley. Their critical and constructive feedback helped improve the quality of this study.

Special thanks are extended to all my teachers and friends who always had a confidence in my future. Last but nor least, I owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to my parents and my sister who always provide invaluable encouragement and moral supports throughout the course of my graduate study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

Since the early 1980s, boot camp[1] has become popular among other alternative sanctions to traditional imprisonment. The number of the prisons with boot camp programs increased from 26 in 1990 to 65 by the end of 1995 (BJS, 1999). There are many reasons for the growth of boot camp. First, since boot camp addresses discipline and self control issue, politicians and policy makers believe boot camp can help them achieve "get tough on crime" policy (MacKenzie & Piquero, 1994, p. 225). Second, corrections officials perceive the importance of boot camp in such aspects as rehabilitation, and recidivism reduction because they believe that therapeutic elements of boot camp will help rehabilitate offenders. As a result, fewer offenders will be rearrested, convicted and returned to prison. (Cowles & Castellano, 1995; MacKenzie & Piquero, 1994, p. 225).

Moreover, given the problem of prison overcrowding, almost every program officials expect boot camp to decrease prison population. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS, 1998), from year-end 1990 to year-end 1998, the Nation's incarcerated population rose by nearly 676,700 inmates, increasing at an average annual rate of 6.0%. State, Federal, and local governments had to accommodate additional

[1] The terms "boot camp" and "shock incarceration" have been used interchangeably. In South Carolina, the "shock ncarceration" terms were used. However, for a consistency reason, the author used only the terms "boot camp" in the present study.

84,587 inmates per year (or the equivalent of 1,627 new inmates per week). The rate of incarceration increased from 1 in every 217 to 1 in every 149 U.S resident. Additionally, by year-end 1998 the Federal prison system was estimated to be operating at 27% over capacity, increasing since year-end 1997(19% over capacity in 1997).

The expectations from both officials and the public are gathered to form correctional boot camp programs across the country. The goals and components of boot camp vary from place to place. Generally, the goals of boot camp include punishment, deterrence, rehabilitation, decreases in prison crowding, and recidivism control. The operations of most programs, however, are almost the same (Bourque, Han, & Hill, 1996; Bourque, Cronin, Pearson, Felker, Han, & Hill, 1996; MacKenzie & Ballow, 1989; MacKenzie & Souryal, 1994; Parent,1989). Recently, the American Correctional Association (ACA) has developed standards for the operation of both adult and juvenile boot camp programs (ACA, 1995a, 1995b). These standards are expected to help program administrators develop an effective boot camp programs as well as improve existing programs for their clients.

As results of a variety of goals, program components and recruitment criteria of boot camp are different from one another. Almost every program, however, targets young, nonviolent, first-time offenders. Participants are normally housed in a military-style environment, which are separated from regular inmates (Peters, Thomas, Zamberlan, & Associates, 1997). The primary activities of boot camp include physical training, labor, drill and ceremony, and summary punishment[2]. Some boot camps might

[2] "Summary punishment is an interim punishment imposed by staff for disciplinary infractions, which entails an on-the-spot, immediate sanction for an infraction. This punishment may include pushups, extra chores, or another work assignment." From Gowdy (1996), pp.23.

provide therapeutic components for participants such as education, job skills, substance abuse counseling and treatment, and aftercare service.

There have been many researches and studies examining the impact and the effectiveness of boot camp programs across the country (Bourque, Han, & Hill, 1996; Bourque, Cronin, Pearson, Felker, Han, & Hill, 1996; Cowles, & Castellano, 1995; MacKenzie& Piquero, 1994; MacKenzie, Shaw, Gowdy, 1996b; MacKenzie, & Souryal, 1994). However, few studies have focused on boot camp and racial issues. In fact, most of the evaluation studies use race only as a control variable. This paucity on information stands in contrast to studies that show increasing numbers of minority groups and widespread disparities by race in the criminal justice system. Bureau of Justice Statistics (1998) statistics show that in 1997 given the number of 100,000 US residents, 8,630 African American males in their late twenties were in prisons in 1997. This figure was relatively high when compared to the number of Hispanic males (2,730) and Caucasian males (868). BJS statistics also show that between 1990 and 1997 the number of Caucasian males in prisons increased by 54% while the increases in the number of African American males were 61% and the number of Caucasian females and African American females were 80%. Additionally, at year-end 1997 (the latest available data), more African American males (548,900) were incarcerated in State or Federal prisons than Caucasian males (541,700).

Boot camp is among significant intermediate sanctions that have been used to cope with problems in the criminal justice system. Unfortunately, the paucity of the information on the effect of boot camp on different ethnic groups provides an unclear picture of how participants from different ethnic groups benefit from the program. Even

though race has been included as a control variable in most criminal justice research, none of them specifically focus on the effect of boot camp on the antisocial attitude of inmates from different ethnic groups. Findings from available studies on the impact of incarceration on prison inmates across racial groups are still inconclusive. Some suggest that the development of violent attitudes and behaviors in prison of Caucasian American and African American did not differ (Ellis et al., 1974; Wright, 1989). Many found that prison violence and homicide are associated with African American inmates (Cazenave and Straus, 1990; Wolfgang et al., 1985). Whereas, some supports violence among Caucasian Americans (Dixon & Lizotte, 1987). These studies, however, were criticized for their research methodology problem (Harer & Steffensmeier, 1996).

Purpose of the Study

This study was designed to examine the antisocial attitude of the boot camp participants across ethnic groups. Specially, the antisocial attitude of Caucasian Americans and African Americans were measured and compared at the beginning of the program and once again after they complete the program. The findings were anticipated to clarify the differences, if any, in attitude change between Caucasian Americans and African Americans. Further, the findings should have an implication on administrative policies of "who" would be likely to benefit from the program. Additionally, with respect to the goals of boot camp the author expects this study to provide empirical evidence to rehabilitation philosophy, showing if boot camp "works". The review of previous studies was presented in Chapter II. The issues of military training vs. deterrence effect,

therapeutic program vs. rehabilitation, and conformity atmosphere of boot camp vs. control theory, and the explanation of antisocial attitude of inmates were also discussed.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Research and Evidence on Boot Camp

Boot Camp as an Alternative Sanction.

Prison overcrowding has been a significant issue in criminal justice system for a long period of time. Among the efforts to solve this problem is to create alternative sentences to traditional incarceration. One of them is to place offenders in the community instead of formal institution. Community corrections such as house arrest, probation, parole, and community service has been widely used since. However, the goal of reducing prison overcrowding could be unrealized because these sanctions that were originally designed as alternatives to incarceration have actually been used for offenders who would otherwise have received a lesser sentence (MacKenzie & Piquero, 1994). That is when another intermediate was initiated—Boot Camp.

Boot camp has been used as an alternative to traditional imprisonment since 1980s. The rapid growth of military boot camp results from many reasons. Among the most important reasons is to help reduce the number of offenders in prisons. One scholar who has devoted so many of her studies on boot camp program is Doris Layton MacKenzie, the University of Maryland. In one of her studies, MacKenzie and Piquero (1994) suggested that almost everyone expect boot camp to reduce the number of offenders in prison. Some believe that as a result of participating in boot camp program, there will be a lower recidivism rates. Thus, fewer prisoners will return to prison and the

need for prison will be reduced. At the individual level, there are different opinions about how they expect a lower recidivism from boot camp. Some believe boot camp will deter offender to commit new crime, while others argue that the program will rehabilitate offender so they will not return to criminal activities once one is released. In both of these situations, prisoners are expected not to return to prison, which help relieve prison overcrowding.

However, the extent that boot camp has an impact on prison overcrowding depends on many factors. One thing that should be taken into consideration is the selection criteria of boot camp. In order to avoid the criticism of "net widening" like other community corrections, boot camp must strictly target only those who otherwise would have been incarcerated in traditional prison. Furthermore, There must be a sufficient number of eligible inmates who successfully complete the boot camp in a shorter time than they would have been in prison (MacKenzie & Piquero, 1994). Therefore, it should be noted that rigid revocation criteria could discourage offender not to volunteer or will drop out and return to prison.

The popular of boot camp also results from the fact that boot camp provides both treatment and punishment. Considering punishment perspective, politician and policy makers support boot camp so that they can appear to be tough on crime (Mackenzie & Piquero, 1994). Additionally, Anderson, Dyson, & Burns (1996) suggested that both conservative and liberal legislature as well as the public also the use of boot camp as an alternative sentence. Conservatives strongly support the use of strict discipline associated with the idea of authority figures confronting offenders and rejecting the excuses that they give for their participation in crime. Not only do they want to see boot camp shock

participants, but they also hope that boot camp graduates will instill in them discipline, responsibility, and respect. Liberals, however, recognize the treatment and rehabilitation components. Since many of boot camp graduates receive GED and learn some job skills, they hope that boot camp will enable them to get better chances in life after they are released. Moreover, liberals encourage the use of boot camp as many more offenders are diverted from traditional imprisonment. They believe that spending time in prison can ultimately change an offender to become a hardened criminal.

Originally, boot camp was designed to cope with prison overcrowding problem. However, when the number of offenders incarcerated in jails are gradually increasing, jail-operated boot camp has been implemented. Although the average length of offenders in jails is relatively short (15-16 days) compared to approximately 2-year stay of prison inmates, jail are increasingly housing inmates who serve many months in confinement (Austin, Jones, & Bolyard, 1996). Nevertheless, scholars suggested that since inmates in jails are so diversified and differs from those in prisons, goals and components of prison boot camp may not apply or may be more difficult to achieve in jail-based boot camp (Austin, Jones, & Bolyard, 1993; McCampbell, 1996).

Boot camp is not limited to only adult offenders. In fact, boot camp has also been used as an alternative sanction in juvenile justice system. The juvenile boot camp program was initiated by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) in July 1990 (Felker & Bourque, 1996). Three demonstration program were in Cleveland, Ohio; Denver, Colorado; and Mobile, Alabama. These programs were designed by borrowing components extensively from adult boot camp. Like adult boot camp, scholars have yet found conclusive results if boot camp "works" for juvenile

offenders (Bottcher & Isorena, 1996; Bourque, Cronin, Pearson, Felker, Han, & Mill, 1996; Cass & Kaltenecker, 1996; Cronin, 1994; Felker & Bourque, 1996; Peters, Thomas, Zamberlan, & Associates, 1997).

Boot Camp and Criminological Theory

The present research was designed based on deterrence and rehabilitation goals of boot camp. The main objective of this study is to examine if boot camp is successful in changing female participants' antisocial attitudes after placing them in a military-like setting and participating in therapeutic programs. The researcher believes that the changes in human behaviors depend heavily on changing their attitudes. If the deterrence and rehabilitation goals are achieved, findings should reveal the positive change of participants' attitudes. A review of control theory and the critique of boot camp under the deterrence and rehabilitation frameworks as well as the evaluation studies of boot camp programs are discussed.

Control Theory.

Control theory was used as a theoretical model in initiating almost all boot camp programs (Clark & Aziz, 1996; Anderson, Dyson, & Burns, 1998). Control theory proposes that "nonconformity is a product of the failure of the social bond. Through the attachment of individuals to others, conformity is assured. When such attachments fail to develop or when they are disrupted, the internalization of legitimate norms becomes problematic" (Clark & Aziz, 1996). It is assumed that offenders entering boot camp are individuals whose bonds to society are weak or broken. By exposing offenders to the

boot camp philosophies and practices, boot camp designers believe that it will help strengthen and restore these bonds.

Considering Hirchi's social control theory, the bonds to society include: (1) attachment to others, (2) commitment to enhancing life, property, and reputation, (3) involvement in conventional activities, and (4) belief in positive human values (Siegel & Senna, 1997). Hirchi's social control theory also assumed that "offenders are opportunistic, impulsive, lack of self-control, and pursue immediate gratification rather than postpone self-pleasure. Such criminals with low self-control normally live for the moment." (Anderson, Dyson, & Burns, 1998, p. 14). This concept was recognized and applied by many boot camp programs. New York's Shock Incarceration, for instance, focuses on the need for offenders to strengthen their indirect controls, their internalized controls, and their controls over opportunities for conventional activities "by promoting responsibility for choices and stressing the consequences of their behavior" (Clark & Aziz, 1996).

Military Basic Training and Deterrence Effect.

Generally, a combination of punitive and rehabilitative program elements of boot camp is expected to serve both deterrence and rehabilitation goal. With regards to punitive program elements, a survey of existing correctional boot camp programs revealed commonality in the use of military drill and ceremony, military bearing and courtesy, physical labor, physical training, and strict discipline (Morash & Rucker, 1990). Namely, these elements in addition to incarceration itself are expected to serve as deterrents.

Specific deterrence is a high-priority goal of boot camps in many states. Researchers found that boot camp programs in Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Texas focused on deterrence goal rather than rehabilitation (MacKeczie & Souryal, 1994). Unfortunately, no study has focused on the examination of boot camp and its specific deterrence effects. Previous researches on specific deterrence of related programs, however, have not yet found promising results. Lotz, Regoli, & Raymond (1978) claimed limited or no deterrent effect as a result of incarceration in training school. Scholars also suggested that the boot camp itself could not deter future crime commission; instead, the offender's fear of the real prison is likely to be an instrumental factor. Likewise, Zachariah (1996) pointed out that when deterrence is set as a goal of the program, boot camp settings are usually located within the prison, so that participants can observe prison inmates and their routine prison activities. Furthermore, boot camp staffs contribute to the offenders' fear by scaring them of sexual exploitation and victimization in prison.

It is unlikely that boot camp experience will lead to increased perceptions of either the certainty or severity of punishment (MacKeczie & Souryal, 1994). In terms of general deterrence, these researchers also found no evidence to believe that the public will be deterred by the threat of serving time in boot camp prison. They stated that interviews with boot camp participants showed that many participants, before entering the program, did not think that they would have trouble meeting program requirements.

Evidences show that the severity of punishment does not guarantee deterrence. Tittle (1980) found the degree in which sanction could deter crimes does not necessarily depend on harshly formal punishments. Rather, informal social sanctions are far more

effective deterrents. The researcher operationally defined the fear of informal social sanctions as the fear that derived from interpersonal and other nonlegal sources. These fears of informal sanctions include peer fear, contingent interpersonal fear, contingent community fear, interpersonal severity, and community severity. The researcher explained that if people who are important to an individual are likely to disapprove a particular behavior and an individual thinks those people will find out in case of commission that behavior, then that possibility will have considerable deterrent effect. Consistent to Tittle (1980), Grasmick and Bursik (1990) found that informal sanctions enforced by parents and peers have more binding deterrent effect than laws and the threat of formal incarceration.

Previous study also found that males and females differ little in deterrence; where differences are apparent the researcher suggested that females should commit less deviance (Tittle, 1980). Furthermore, sensitivity and responsiveness of an individual toward sanction threats were found correlating to deterrence. That is, if a person is both sensitive and responsive to sanction threats, the person are more likely to be prevented from committed deviant behaviors.

Boot Camp, Rehabilitation Goal, and Antisocial Attitudes.

Most of boot camp programs provide participants rehabilitative and treatment components. Typically, these components include academic education, vocational education, drug and alcohol education and treatment, therapeutic training, counseling, etc. Some programs were specifically designed for subgroup offenders such as parenting skills for fathers and mothers. The degree in which these programs are implemented

depends very much on the main goal of boot camp. Boot camps that focus on deterrence goal (i.e. in Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, and South Carolina) might not have a wide variety of therapeutic components as do the boot camps that emphasize the important of rehabilitation (i.e. in New York).

Namely, it is difficult to reach a consensus on the measure of success of boot camp since all involved parties differ in their expectations of boot camp. Lower recidivism, prison cost saving, the reduction of prison crowding, and the crime commission rates are often used as success criteria in general evaluation studies. In the present research, the change in participants' antisocial attitudes and program attitudes were used as a criteria to examine if boot camp helps rehabilitate participating offenders. Unfortunately, there are not many researches that specifically studied the boot camp effect on participant's attitude.

The Oregon SUMMIT program (Success Using Motivation, Morale, Intensity, and Treatment) recognizes the importance of attitude change of their inmate clients (Beers & Duval, 1996). SUMMIT program administrators believe in the idea that changing thinking results in a change in behavior. Basically, the program focuses on cognitive change. The boot camp inmates are taught to see themselves as others see them and take responsibility for who they are what they have done. Evidences show promising outcome of SUMMIT program. Program administrators claimed that the program has brought intensity to the change process and enhances the inmates' abilities to internalize new attitudes and behaviors (Beers & Duval, 1996).

According to MacKenzie & Souryal (1993), there have been two major models proposed to explain the antisocial of prisoner: the Deprivation Model, and the

Importation Model. The Deprivation Model emphasizes that the antisocial attitudes develop in response to environmental conditions. The assertions of this model are as follows:

> "... there are unique features of prison environment that negatively influence inmates' behavior and attitudes (Goodstein and Wright, 1989). As a result, inmates form a normative system often called the inmate code that enable them to 'reject the rejecters.' The inmate code is reflected in prisonized attitudes that are anti-staff and anti-prison. Such attitudes are thought to be particularly problematic because they conflict with positive behavior and motivation in correctional programs. In general, inmates become more prisonized as time passes in prison and inmates who are incarcerated in facilities that emphasize custody more than treatment have more prisonized attitudes (Field, 1981)." (MacKenzie & Souryal, 1993)

According to Harer & Steffensmeir (1996), the deprivation predicts that Caucasian and African American were slightly different, if at all, in prison violence. They quoted, "It is because blacks in society are more brutalized than whites that they are more aggressive in this wider context, and it is because black and white convicts are equally brutalized in prisons that they are equally violent."

Contrary to the Deprivation Model, the Importation Model assumes that antisocial attitudes reflect the experience that offenders had before entering prisons. Therefore, inmates bring with them to prison these attitudes rather than developed in response to deprivations in prison. The Importation asserts that African American are more likely

than Caucasian American to be violent at prison entry (Harer & Steffensmeir, 1996). This is because this model assumes that in the larger society the level of violence of African American is much higher than Caucasian American.

If the boot camp with its strict discipline and military-like atmosphere is viewed as a custody oriented settings, one would expect increased prisonization and antisocial attitudes. However, since some boot camp provide therapeutic programs that are expected to rehabilitate inmates during the course of incarceration, one might expect a less antisocial attitudes of inmates after they graduate. Paucity of evidence makes it difficult to determine the impact of boot camp on the inmates' attitudes.

Findings from one available study reveal that overall, boot camp graduates become more positive about their boot camp experience after completing the program (MacKenzie & Souryal, 1994). On the other hand, prison inmate as a comparison group either did not change or be more negative about their traditional imprisonment. Interestingly, both boot camp participants and prison inmate did not differ in term of their antisocial attitude. Both became less antisocial. The researchers also found that time devoted to rehabilitation, program rigor, and voluntariness related to greater reductions in antisocial attitude.

In support to Deprivation Model, Morash & Rucker (1990) argued that boot camp provides setting conducive to high level of unpredictability and contrived stress rather than promoting rehabilitation. They suggested that boot camp environments are not likely to encourage prosocial behaviors. Instead, the antisocial behavior is increased when program staffs provide aggressive models for behavior. Similarly, MacKenzie and

Souryal (1994) also pointed out boot camp programs could not maximize their treatment potential due to some limitations especially the authoritarian atmosphere of boot camp.

Evidences also show that individuals response distinctively to prison environment and treatment program when race difference is addressed. Baldwin's theory of Black personality explained the unique development of norms, attitude, and personality of African American (Roberts, 1996). In her study, Roberts (1996) cited that factors that affect Black identity include parental socialization, quality of interracial interaction, and value oriented. Apparently, the roles of these factors are relatively different from other ethnic group. The study indicates that the message transmitted from African American parents to their children about their heritage will definitely impact on the nature of their racial identification. Mothers in Black families play an important role in the socio-emotional environment. When considering the following dimensions with Caucasian Americans: (1) harmony with nature vs. control over nature, (2) spiritualism vs. materialism, (3) collectivism vs. individualism, (4) strong vs. weak religious orientation, and (5) interdependence vs. separateness, African Americans score significantly higher across the first dimensions (Robert, 1996).

Although the effect of boot camp on each individual might be different, Gowdy (1996a) suggested that any subgroup of offenders can be targeted for participation in a treatment boot camp as long as they share a particular problem that can be altered through the use of treatment intervention provided by the program. To achieve this treatment model, careful attention should be given to the design and all aspects of boot camp programs for women and other minority groups.

Summary

Considering deterrence and rehabilitation goal of boot camp, no empirical evidence has not yet found the promising result that boot camp programs provide more effective mechanism than traditional imprisonment or any other community sanctions. Rather, the strict discipline and aggressive environment were found related to an increased stress of participants. The only vivid positive outcome, according to boot camp participants, is the fact that they become more physically fit as a result of basic training.

As far as the antisocial attitudes, two models have been proposed to explain these attitudes—the Deprivation Model and Importation Model. The Deprivation Model proposed that the antisocial attitudes are the result of inmates' response to prison environment. On the other hand, the Importation Model argued that these attitudes reflect the experiences offenders had before they entering prison. Therefore, offenders import antisocial attitudes into prison.

The impact of boot camp on inmates' antisocial attitudes has not yet been cleared. Available evidence provides inconclusive answer. Previous research shows both positive and negative effect of boot camp on participants. Emotionally, boot camps inmates benefit differently from the program given their socio-demographic and criminal background. Physically, most of the participants report the positive outcomes.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Population and Sample[3]

The population of this study were convicted offenders in South Carolina who were participating in boot camp program when the data were collected. It should be noted that boot camp samples were randomly selected twice. The first boot camp samples were drawn from those who participating in the program when it was being administered by Probation, Parole, and Pardon Services in 1989. The second samples were randomly selected from those who participating the program when it was under the Department of Corrections in 1991.

Data Collection and Instruments

The data used in this research were retrieved from the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) database[4], which was originally collected by MacKenzie & Souryal (1994). MacKenzie and Souryal (1994) collected data from both official records and inmates self-report questionnaires. Self-report questionnaires were conducted at the beginning of their period of incarceration and once again at

---

[3] For additional detail on data collection and sampling method, see:
MacKenzie, D. L. & Souryal, C. (1993). Inmate attitude change during incarceration: A comparison of boot camp and traditional prison (A final report to the National Institute of Justice). College Park, MD: University of Maryland. And
MacKenzie, D. L., & Souryal, C. (1994). Multisite evaluation of shock incarceration (Report No. NCJ 142462). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

[4] Study No. 6986. Abstract, codebook, and data are available on-line on ICPSR web site.

approximately 90 days later. Researchers also conducted interviews with correctional officers, boot camp inmates and parole agents supervising boot camp graduates. The interviews helped verify the validity and reliability of self-report questionnaires.

A "record data" instrument was used to collect data on age, race, sex offense type, sentence length, and prior adult felony arrests and convictions. The self-report questionnaires consisted of Inmate Self-Report History and Inmate Self-Report Attitude. Data collected by Inmate Self-Report History included employment, education, drug and alcohol use. Meanwhile, Inmate Self-Report Attitude was used to measure changes in attitudes over time. It was administered at the beginning of boot camp and again at approximately 90 days later. Inmate Self-Report Attitude consisted of two scales: the Jesness Antisocial Attitude Scale (See Appendix A) and Program Attitude Scale (See Appendix B). Both Program Attitude Scale and Jesness's Scale have 5 attributes like Likert's scale, ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strong agree." The scores from both scales were used as dependent variables of the study. Since Jesness Antisocial Attitude Scale was developed and tested by previous researchers, its validity and reliability were not tested again in this study. According to previous study, the Cronbach's Alpha of Jesness Antisocial Attitude Scale was .73 for South Carolina samples indicating that this scale was quite reliable (MacKenzie & Souryal, 1993).

The reliability of Program Attitude Scale, however, was tested in this study (See Appendix C). The Cronbach's Alpha for Time 1 was .77 and Time 2 was .81. The values of Cronbach's Alpha were relatively large for both Time 1 and Time 2, which means the scale was reliable.

Research Setting.

Boot camp in South Carolina is an alternative sentence to prison incarceration. According to MacKenzie and Souryal (1994), there are two phases of the boot camp administration in South Carolina. During the first couple years, the boot camp had been run by the Probation, Parole, and Pardon Services. Judges was the authority figures who sentence offenders directly to the program. However, after the legislative changes in 1990, boot camp program has been technically under the supervision of the South Carolina Department of Corrections (SCDC). The intent of this change was not to change the operation of the program, but to alter the selection of boot camp participants. The new legislation empowered the Department of Corrections to select participants from offenders sentenced to the SCDC. Apparently, the control over the placement offender was transferred from judges to SCDC.

Eligibility criteria for boot camp that remains unchanged after the program was transferred were as follows:

> "(1) eligible for parole in 2 years, or if sentenced, convicted of an offense that carries a sentence of at least five years (or returned for probation violation);
> (2) offenders convicted of violent offenses...such as homicide or criminal sexual conduct are ineligible; however, offenders convicted of offenses that are violent in nature such as assault and battery, but are not classified as violent by the Omnibus Crime Control Act are still considered eligible;
> (3) physically and mentally capable of participation;
> (4) no previous incarceration in a state correctional facility or shock probation/ incarceration program...and

(5) sentence that does not specifically prohibit shock incarceration." (MacKenzie and Souryal, 1994)

After the legislative change, age limit was changed from 17-24 years of age to 25 years or younger. For the "old" boot camp, boot camp participation and exit were involuntary. However, according to the virtue of "new" boot camp, offenders who are sentenced directly to SCDC and qualified for the program must voluntarily agree to participate in boot camp. Offenders, though, have the right to drop out voluntarily. Upon the graduation, offenders received moderate community supervision.

Boot camp in South Carolina targeted both male and female offenders who convicted of nonviolent offenses. The main goal of the program was deterrence. The setting was located in larger prison, while separate program was developed for female inmates. The program length was 90 days. Even though the main goal of South Carolina boot camp's focus on deterrence rather than rehabilitation, offenders had to participate in therapeutic programs. Offenders in South Carolina spent 4 hours every day in educational programs and 3 hours each week in drug education. However, drug treatment program was not among the high priority goals. Accordingly, offenders spent little time in treatment.

Research Questions

Research questions of the present study are:

1. Are Caucasian Americans and African Americans different in terms of their antisocial attitude before and after participating in boot camp?

2. Do Caucasian Americans and African Americans change their antisocial attitude after graduating in boot camp?

3. Are Caucasian Americans and African Americans different in terms of their attitude toward boot camp before and after participating in boot camp?

4. Do Caucasian Americans and African Americans change their attitude toward boot camp after graduating from boot camp?

Hypotheses

The hypotheses of this study are as follows:

Hypothesis 1: After participating in boot camp, Caucasian Americans will positively change their antisocial attitude.

Hypothesis 2: After participating in boot camp, Caucasian Americans will positively change their attitude toward boot camp.

Hypothesis 3: After participating in boot camp, African Americans will positively change their antisocial attitude.

Hypothesis 4: After participating in boot camp, African Americans will positively change their attitude toward boot camp.

Hypothesis 5: Before participating in boot camp, the antisocial attitude of Caucasian Americans and African Americans *are* different.

Hypothesis 6: After participating in boot camp, the antisocial attitude of Caucasian Americans and African Americans *are not* different.

Hypothesis 7: Before participating in boot camp, the attitude toward boot camp of Caucasian Americans and African Americans *are* different.

Hypothesis 8: After participating in boot camp, the attitude toward boot camp of Caucasian Americans and African Americans *are not* different.

Variables

Independent Variables.

1. Socio-demographic Characteristics: race, status of sample, age, education, employment, income, and military experience. All but education and employment were collected from official data.

2. Criminal Characteristics: type of crime, prior adult arrest record, prior adult conviction record, and length of sentence

Type of crime includes violent (robbery, assault and battery), property crime (burglary, theft, and larceny), drugs, and other.

3. Other Characteristics: drugs and alcohol abuse index

Dependent Variables.

The dependent variables are samples' scores from Jesness Antisocial Attitude Scale and Program Attitude Scale. The Jesness Antisocial Attitude Scale measures antisocial attitudes. Specifically, this scale was used to measure attitudes towards police and authorities, level of maturity, and degree of social deviance. The Jesness Antisocial Scale consisted of 30 items. The scale has been found to be associated with recidivism and short-term change in behavior (MacKenzie and Souryal, 1994). For the interpretation, the higher the Antisocial Social Attitude score, the more antisocial the samples are.

Program Attitude Scale, on the other hand, consisted of 12 items that measured the degree to which offenders expected their period of incarceration to motivate them to change in a positive manner, and offenders' believes that the boot camp will help them make positive changes. The higher the Program Attitude Score, the more positive about the program.

Data Analysis Procedures

To test the hypotheses, the author employed Bivariate and Multivariate Regression as well as Independent Sample T-Test. It should be noted that missing values in the data file were excluded from the analysis. Chapter IV presents the results of data analysis. First, socio-demographic and criminal characteristics of Caucasian Americans and African Americans were compared and discussed. Then, a paired sample t-test was conducted to examine if Caucasian American and African American offenders changed their antisocial attitudes and their attitudes about boot camp after completing the program. Next, bivariate regression analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between each socio-demographic and criminal characteristics and scores on Antisocial Attitude Scale and Program Attitude Scale. This was conducted to examine if race was a significant predictor of antisocial attitudes and program attitudes. Subsequent to the bivariate regression analysis, an independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the attitudes of Caucasian American and African American and to verify the influence of race and antisocial and program attitude. Lastly, multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between race and scores on both scales when controlling for other predictors.

Summary

Data used in this study was retrieved from ICPSR web site. Samples were randomly selected twice from convicted offenders who were participating in boot camp program in South Carolina. Independent variables include socio-demographic and criminal background of samples, while the dependent variables were scores from Antisocial Attitude Scale and Program Attitude Scale. Both bivariate and multivariate analysis were used to analyzed data. Results of the analysis were presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Sample Characteristics

Socio-Demographic Characteristics.

Of all 242 samples in this study, 97 (41.1%) were Caucasian American (CA) and 145 (59.9%) were African American (AA). Chi-square analysis and independent sample t-test were used to examine the difference in socio-demographic background between CA and AA. According to Table 1, CA and AA were significantly different from each other in terms of their status, employment, age, and education. The majority of CA (62.9%, n=61) were old boot camp graduates, while approximately 66% (n=95) of AA were new boot camp graduates who were included in the study after the boot camp program was transferred to the Department of Corrections of South Carolina. At the time of crime commission, 70.1% (n=68) of CA and 54.5% (n=79) reported that they were employed. Apparently, the percentage of AA who did not have a job was much higher than of CA. Further, the average age at prison entry of CA were 20.15 years, and significantly younger than AA (20.98 years). Given their educational background, the average years in school of CA and AA were 9.73 and 10.41 years respectively. It should be noted that the number of years in school did not represent the intellectual capability of the sample. Rather, it simply measured the length of years the samples had spent in educational system.

Table 1

Socio-Demographic and Criminal Characteristics of Samples

Variables	Caucasian American (CA) n	Caucasian American (CA) %	African American (AA) n	African American (AA) %
Status of Sample*				
"Old" boot camp graduates	61	62.90	50	34.50
"New" boot camp graduates	36	37.10	95	65.50
Gender				
Male	79	81.40	127	87.60
Female	18	18.60	18	12.40
Military Experience				
No	93	95.90	139	95.90
Yes	4	4.10	6	4.10
Employment Status*				
No	29	29.90	66	45.50
Yes	68	70.10	79	54.50
Type of Present Crime*				
Violent	7	7.40	16	11.00
Property	56	58.90	55	37.90
Drugs	15	15.80	51	35.20
Other	17	17.90	23	15.90
Prior Adult Arrest				
No	32	33.30	32	22.10
Yes	65	67.00	113	77.90
Prior Adult Conviction				
No	51	52.60	72	49.70
Yes	46	47.40	73	50.30
Alcohol Use Index				
Lesser Problems	53	55.20	94	65.70
1	14	14.60	22	15.40
2	8	8.30	8	5.60
3	11	11.50	10	7.00
4	7	7.30	4	2.80
Greater Problems	3	3.10	5	3.50
Drug Use Index*				
Lesser Problems	52	53.60	108	75.00
1	15	15.50	10	6.90
2	9	9.30	9	6.30
3	5	5.20	11	7.60
4	9	9.30	3	2.10
5	5	5.20	3	2.10
Greater Problems	2	2.10	-	-
Education (Years in School)**				
Mean (S.D.)	9.73 (1.52)		10.41 (1.46)	
Estimated Monthly Income				
Mean (S.D.)	587.01 (565.52)		579.01 (563.56)	
Age at Prison Entry (Years)**				
Mean (S.D.)	20.15 (2.08)		20.98 (2.52)	
Length of Sentence (Months)**				
Mean (S.D.)	36.41 (24.30)		28.47 (23.55)	

Note. * CA is significantly different from AA (Chi-square significant at $p < .05$).

** CA is significantly different from AA (T-Test significant at $p < .05$).

However, statistics did not show the significant difference between the two samples in terms of their gender, military experience, and income. Table 1 shows that the majority of both CA and AA were males (81.4% of CA and 87.6% of AA). Additionally, almost 96% of both CA and AA reported that they did not have military experience. Their incomes were also not significantly different from each other; the average monthly income of CA and AA were about 587 and 579 dollars respectively.

Criminal Characteristics.

Criminal characteristics include type of crime, prior adult arrest, prior adult conviction, and length of sentence. These data were retrieved from the official data by the original study. Chi-square analysis and independent sample t-test were used to examine the difference in criminal characteristics of Caucasian American and African American.

Table 1 shows that CA and AA were significantly different from each other in terms of their type of crime and length of sentence. Almost 60% (n=56) of CA were convicted of property offense, while 15.8% (n=15) and 7.4% (n=7) were convicted of drugs and violent crime respectively. The percentage of property offense of CA were obviously higher than that of AA (37.90%, n=55). However, when taken into consideration violent crime and drug crime, the percentage of AA was much higher than of CA. About 35.2% (n=51) of AA were convicted of drugs crime while only 15.8% (n=15) of CA with this same offense. Further, 11% (n=16) of AA were convicted of violent crime while 7.4% (n=7) found guilty with this violent offense.

When comparing the type of crime, CA were convicted of more relatively serious offenses than those of AA. One would expect to see harsher punishment for CA. However, it was not the case in this study. Interestingly, the average length of sentence of CA (36.41 months) were significantly lower than of AA (months).

Given prior adult arrest and prior adult conviction background, evidence did not show the significant difference between CA and AA. The majority of both CA (67%, n=65) and AA (77.9%, n=113) had previous arrest record. As far as the conviction, 52.6% (n=51) of CA did not have previous conviction records. On the other hand, the percentage of AA who had and did not have prior conviction record were as very close as 49.7% (n=72) and 50.30% (n=73).

Other Characteristics.

Other characteristics include drug use and alcohol use index. Independent Sample T-Test was conducted to examine if CA and AA were different in terms of their drug use and alcohol use index. The index ranges from Lesser Problems, 1, 2, 3, 4 to Greater Problems. The result in Table 1 shows that CA and AA were significantly different from each other only in term of drug use. Slightly more than half of CA (53.6%, n=52) reported that they had lesser problem. Meanwhile as large as 75% (n=108) of AA claimed to have lesser problem.

The Change in Antisocial Attitude and Program Attitude of Caucasian American (CA) and African American (AA)

The results in Table 1 reveals that CA and AA were different in some characteristics. These findings were going to be taken into consideration when comparing their antisocial attitudes and program attitudes. Yet, before comparing the difference between CA and AA in terms of their antisocial and program attitudes, a paired sample t-test were conducted to examine if CA and AA had any change in their antisocial attitudes and program attitudes after participating in boot camp. Separate models were examined for CA and AA. In each model, the scores from Time 1 and Time 2 were measured and compared to determine the change in their antisocial and program attitudes overtime. The results were presented in Table 3 and used to test Hypothesis 1, 2, 3, and 4. Overall, the samples were less antisocial after participating in boot camp. The average antisocial score significantly decreased from 14.02 to 13.31 ($p = .029$). However, even though the average program score of general sample increased at the end of boot camp, their mean difference was not significant ($p = .529$). The results from the analysis of CA and AA were as follows:

Table 2

Paired Sample T-Test for Mean Difference of the Scores: A Comparison Between Time 1 and Time 2

Sample	Antisocial Attitude									Program Attitude								
	Time1		Time 2		Mean	S.D.	t	df	Sig.	Time1		Time 2		Mean	S.D.	t	df	Sig.
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Difference				(2-tailed)	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Difference				(2-tailed)
All Sample[a]	14.02	4.69	13.31	4.97	**0.71***	4.96	2.195	234	**0.029**	47.67	7.02	48.01	7.30	-.34	7.90	-.630	214	0.529
Caucasian American[b]	14.80	4.10	13.01	4.84	**1.79 ***	4.53	3.847	94	**0.000**	48.46	7.00	50.04	6.47	**-1.58 ***	6.49	-2.302	88	**0.024**
African American[c]	13.49	5.00	13.51	5.07	-0.02	5.12	-.049	139	0.961	47.11	7.01	46.57	7.53	0.54	8.68	0.698	125	0.487

* $p<.05$

[a] n for Antisocial Attitude = 235, n for Program Attitude = 215

[b] n for Antisocial Attitude = 95, n for Program Attitude = 89

[c] n for Antisocial Attitude = 140, n for Program Attitude = 126

Hypothesis 1: After participating in boot camp, Caucasian Americans will positively change their antisocial attitude.

As shown in Table 3, the average antisocial score of CA at Time 1 was 14.80. The average score decreased to 13.01 at Time 2. The difference between these two means was 1.79 ($p = .000$). The results imply that there was a significant change in antisocial attitude of CA after participating in boot camp; that is, CA has become less antisocial. The Hypothesis 1 was then supported.

Hypothesis 2: After participating in boot camp, Caucasian Americans will positively change their attitude toward boot camp.

When considering the average program score, the mean difference of -1.58 ($p = .024$) indicate that the average program score had significantly increased from 48.46 at Time 1 to 50.04 at Time 2. The statistics reveal that the attitude toward boot camp of CA had positively changed over time. They became more positive about boot camp after they had completed the program. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was supported.

Hypothesis 3: After participating in boot camp, African Americans will positively change their antisocial attitude.

The average antisocial score of AA at Time 1 and Time 2 were 13.49 and 13.51 respectively. The mean difference was –0.02. Apparently, there was a very minimal change in their average score. Given that the t-test was not significant ($p = .961$), the null hypothesis that the two means were equal cannot be rejected. That is, the average

antisocial score of AA was not significantly different over time. Consequently, Hypothesis 3 was not supported.

Hypothesis 4: After participating in boot camp African Americans will positively change their attitude toward boot camp.

At time 1, the average program score of AA was 47.11. It decreased to 46.57 at Time 2. AA seemed to be less positive after they finished the program. However, this change was not statistically significant since the significance level of t ($p = .487$) was greater than .05. The null hypothesis that the two means were equal cannot be rejected, indicating that the average program score of CA did not significantly different. Hypothesis 4, therefore, was not supported.

The Bivariate Regression of Sample Characteristics and Scores on Antisocial Attitude and Program Attitude

Given the findings in Table 2, samples generally had become less antisocial after graduating from the program. However, they did not significantly change program attitude over time. In addition, separated paired sample t-test revealed that CA became less antisocial and more positive about the program while AA had no significant change in their antisocial and program attitudes. These findings imply that race seems to be a significant predictor of antisocial attitudes and program attitudes. Thus, bivariate regression analysis was conducted to examine if race really relates to those attitudes. Further, to make sure that the study did not overlook the effects of other characteristics, all other socio-demographic and criminal background were also examined. Since race,

status of sample, gender, military experience, employment, type of crime, prior adult arrest, and prior adult conviction are qualitative variables, they were recoded into dummy variables. For race, Caucasian American was coded 1, and African American was coded 0. For status of sample, new boot camp graduate was value 1, and old boot camp graduate was coded 0. For gender, male was coded 1, and female was coded 0. For military experience, employment, prior adult arrest, and prior adult conviction, yes was coded 1, and no was coded 0. Finally, type of crime was recreated into three dummy variables: offense 1, offense 2, and offense 3. All attributes of type of crime then were recoded to be compared to property crime. That is, for offense 1, violent crime was coded 1, property crime was coded 0; for offense 2, drugs crime was coded 1, property crime was coded 0; and for offense 3, other was coded 1, and property crime was coded 0. The result of bivariate regression analysis was shown in Table 3.

Sample Characteristics and Scores on Antisocial Attitude Scale.

According to Table 3, race was not a significant predictor at both Time 1 and Time 2. This indicates that being CA or AA does not affect score on Antisocial Attitude Scale. Rather, gender, alcohol use, drug use, and education significantly related to antisocial attitude score at the beginning of boot camp program. After the sample completed boot camp, status of sample, gender, offense 3, and alcohol use were the significant predictors. Gender and alcohol use were the only two predictors that significantly related to the scores both at the beginning of the program and after they graduated.

Table3

Bivariate Regression Analysis for Socio-Demographic and Criminal Charateristics and Scores on Antisocial Attitude and Program Attitude

Predictors	Antisocial Attitude Score						Program Attitude Score					
	Time 1			Time 2			Time 1			Time 2		
	B	S.E.	R^2	B	S.E.	R^2	B	S.E.	R^2	B	S.E.	R^2
Race (Caucasian, 1)	1.16	.62	.02	-.52	.66	.00	1.27	.97	.00	**3.16***	.96	.05
Status of Sample (New, 1)	.51	.61	.00	**1.40***	.64	.02	-1.7	.96	.00	-3.72	.94	.07
Gender (Female, 1)	**-1.86***	.84	.02	**-2.86***	.89	.04	1.46	1.34	.01	**5.20***	1.31	.07
Military (Yes, 1)	-.92	1.52	.00	.30	1.63	.00	-2.29	2.39	.00	-3.14	2.42	.01
Employment (Yes, 1)	.77	.62	.01	.12	.66	.00	-.74	.98	.00	-1.84	.98	.02
Offense1 (Violent, 1)**	-.50	1.04	.00	-1.21	1.10	.01	-.57	1.63	.00	.13	1.64	.00
Offense2 (Drug, 1)**	.91	.68	.01	.32	.73	.00	-.40	1.07	.00	**-2.60***	1.07	.03
Offense3 (other, 1)**	1.52	.81	.01	**2.08***	8.62	.02	-.87	1.28	.00	-.58	1.30	.00
Prior Arrest (Yes, 1)	.62	.69	.00	.29	.73	.00	.64	1.08	.00	-.93	1.09	.00
Prior Conviction (Yes, 1)	-.22	.61	.00	-.65	.65	.00	.03	.95	.00	-.04	.97	.00
Alcohol Use	**.66***	.21	.04	**.48***	.22	.02	.04	.33	.00	-.27	.34	.00
Drug Use	**.76***	.20	.06	.36	.22	.01	.32	.32	.04	.50	.33	.01
Education	**-.48***	.20	.02	-.37	.22	.01	**.70***	.32	.02	.02	.32	.00
Monthly Income	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.01	.00	.00	.00
Age	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
Length of Sentence	-.01	.01	.00	-.03	.01	.02	.00	.20	.00	.04	.02	.02

* $p<.05$

** Compared to Property Offense

Time 1

As shown in Table 3, females (B = -1.86) had less antisocial score than males, meaning females were less antisocial at the beginning of boot camp. Being a female (R^2 = 02), however, can predict only 2% of variation of the antisocial score. Further, the positive relationship between alcohol use (B = .66) and antisocial score implies that the samples who had more serious problems with alcohol were more antisocial. Likewise, those who reported having more serious problem with drug use (B = .76) had a tendency to be more antisocial. About 4% and 6% of variation of antisocial score can be predictable by alcohol use (R^2 = .04) and drug use (R^2 = .06) respectively. On the other hand, the negative relationship between education and antisocial score (B= -48) indicates the fact that the higher the education the sample had, the less antisocial. Education (R^2 = .02) can predict 2% of variation of antisocial score.

Time 2

Status of sample, gender, offense 3, and alcohol use were significant predictors at Time 3. For the status of sample, new boot camp graduates (B = 1.40) had a higher score than old boot camp graduates, meaning new boot camp graduates were more likely to be antisocial after completing boot camp. Only 2% of variation of the antisocial attitude score can be predictable by status of sample (R^2 = .02).

For gender, females (B = -2.86) again had lower score than males at Time 2. This implies that females were less likely than males to have an antisocial attitude after they graduated from boot camp. Gender (R^2 = .04) as a single variable can explain only 4% of variation of the antisocial score.

Offense 3 was a dummy variable of type of crime and had two categories (property = 0, other = 1). In this study, "other" referred to any crimes other than violent, property, and drugs. Table 2 shows that offense 3 (B = 2.08) was a significant predictor of antisocial score, indicating that samples convicted of offense 3 were more antisocial than those convicted of property crime. Predictability of offense 3 (R^2 = .02) was 2% of variation of antisocial score.

Alcohol use (B = .48) was also a significant predictor of antisocial score at Time 2. Samples who reported more serious problem of alcohol were more likely to be antisocial even after completing the program. Even though alcohol use was a significant predictor for both Time 1 and Time 2, the predictability was somewhat decreased. At Time 1, alcohol use can predict 4% (R^2 = .04) of variation of antisocial score, while it decreased to 2% (R^2 = .02) at Time 2.

Sample Characteristics and Score on Program Attitude Scale.

For the program score, race was a significant predictor at Time 2. Table 3 shows that CA compared to AA were more positive about boot camp program after they graduated. Being CA can predict 5% of variation of program score. In addition, other predictors that significantly related to program score were gender, offense 2, and education.

Time 1

From Table 3, at the beginning of boot camp, education was the only predictor that significantly related to program attitude score. The positive relationship between education and program score (B = .70) indicates that the higher the education, the more

positive about boot camp. The predictability of education was 2% of variation of program score.

Time 2

At the end of boot camp, race, gender, and offense 2 were significant predictors of program attitude score. Table 2 reveals that females' program score (B = 5.20) were higher than males at Time 2. That is, females were more positive about boot camp after completing the program. Predictability of gender at Time 2 was 7% (R^2 = .07), indicating that when the samples were females, one can predict 7% of variation of program score.

Offense 2 was also a significant predictor of program score at Time 2. Offense 2 was a dummy variable of type of crime, representing drug crime in comparison to property crime (drug crime = 1, and property crime = 0). As shown in Table 2, the negative relationship between offense 2 and program score (B = -2.60) revealed that the samples convicted of drug crime had less score than those convicted of property crime. That is, compared to those convicted of property crime, samples convicted of drug offense graduated from boot camp with less positive attitude about the program. Further, offense 2 (R^2 = .03) can predict 3% of variation of program score at Time 2.

<u>The Average Scores on Antisocial Attitude Scale and Program Attitude Scale:</u>

<u>A Comparison Between Caucasian American (CA) and African American (AA)</u>

From Table 3, the results of bivariate regression analysis indicate that race was a significant predictor only of program attitudes at Time 2. To verify these findings, four separate models of independent sample t-test were conducted, comparing the average scores on both scales of CA and AA at Time 1 and Time 2. The results were presented in

Table 4 and 5. Levene's test for equality of variance (F value) in Table 5 was used to determine if the standard deviation of the two samples were equal. F value helps determine which t-test value should be used; if the F value was *not* significant, one would assume the *equal* variance of the two samples and vice versa.

Antisocial Score.

At Time 1, the average antisocial score of AA was 13.61 while the average of CA was 14.77. Given these average scores, CA seems more antisocial than AA at the beginning of the program. However, statistics in Table 5 does not support this anticipation. Given the significant F value of Antisocial Scale at Time 1 (F=5.610, p = .019), the t value of -.1963 (p = .051) was assumed. Since the significance level of t was greater than .05, the null hypothesis that the two means were equal cannot be rejected. This implies that the average scores of CA and AA at Time 1 were *not* different.

Table 4 shows that the average antisocial score of AA and CA at Time 2 were 13.52 and 13.01 respectively. As shown in Table 5, the F value of .395 (p = .530) was not significant; therefore, t value of .780 (p = .436) was assumed. Given the significant of t (p > .05), the null hypothesis that the means of the two means were equal cannot be rejected. This implies that the average score of CA and AA were *not* different.

Table 4

The Average Scores on Antisocial Attitude Scale and Program Attitude Scale: A Comparison of Caucasian American (CA) and African American (AA)

Scales	Race	N	Mean	S.D.	S.E.
Antisocial Scale: Time 1	AA	144	13.61	5.01	0.42
	CA	97	14.77	4.14	0.42
Antisocial Scale: Time 2	AA	141	13.52	5.06	0.43
	CA	95	13.01	4.84	0.50
Program Scale: Time 1	AA	135	47.00	7.31	0.63
	CA	94	48.27	7.02	0.72
Program Scale: Time 2	AA	136	46.70	7.52	0.64
	CA	92	49.86	6.47	0.67

Note. One might notice that the mean scores of samples in this table are different from ones presented in Table 2. This results from the difference in the number of samples included in the analysis. In Table 2, each sample must have scores at both Time 1 and Time 2 so that they can be compared in the analysis. Samples who had a score only Time 1 or Time 2 were excluded from the analysis. On the other hand, in Table 4, the analysis foucused on the difference between CA and AA, not the difference between Time 1 and Time 2. Therefore, those who had a score only for Time 1 or Time 2 were included in the analysis.

Table 5

The Independent Sample T-Test for the Average Score on Antisocial Attitude Scale and Program Attitude Scale: A Comparison of Cacasian American and African American

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variance		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	S.E. Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the mean	
									Lower	Upper
Antisocial Scale: Time 1	Equal variances assumed	5.610	0.019	-1.892	239	0.060	-1.162	0.614	-2.372	0.048
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.963	229.052	0.051	-1.162	0.592	-2.329	0.005
Antisocial Scale: Time 2	Equal variances assumed	0.395	0.530	0.780	234	0.436	0.514	0.660	-0.785	1.814
	Equal variances not assumed			0.787	207.761	0.432	0.514	0.654	-0.775	1.803
Program Scale: Time 1	Equal variances assumed	0.084	0.773	-1.311	227	0.191	-1.266	0.966	-3.169	0.637
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.320	205.244	0.188	-1.266	0.959	-3.157	0.625
Program Scale: Time 2	Equal variances assumed	1.185	0.277	-3.290	226	0.001	-3.160	0.961	-5.053	-1.267
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.386	213.229	0.001	-3.160	0.933	-5.000	-1.321

Program Score

At time 1, the average program score of AA as shown in Table 4 was 47.00 while CA had an average score of 48.27. Apparently, CA had a higher average score than AA, indicating that at beginning of the program, CA were more likely to be positive about boot camp. However, evidence in Table 5 does not show the significant difference between the two means. Considering the F value of .084 ($p = .773$), the equal variances of the two samples were assumed. Given the t value of –1.311 with the significance of 0.191 ($p > .05$), the null hypothesis was accepted. That is, the average program scores of CA and AA were *not* different.

At Time 2, the average program scores of AA and CA in Table 4 were 46.70 and 49.86 respectively. Again, CA tended to be more positive about boot camp since they had a higher average score. As shown in Table 5, the significant of F ($F = 1.185$, $p = .277$) was greater than .05, the equal variances of the two samples were assumed. The t value of –3.290 ($p = .001$) with the significance level of less than .05 results in the rejection of the null hypothesis that the two sample means were equal. Statistically, the attitudes toward boot camp of CA and AA at Time 2 were significantly different.

The Multiple Regression Analysis for Sample Characteristics and Scores on Antisocial Attitude Scale and Program Scale

Table 3, 4 and 5 indicate that the results of bivarate regression and independent sample t-test were consistent. That is, race was a significant predictor only for program attitude at Time 2. However, when conducting a bivariate regression, the author focused only on the effect of race on antisocial and program attitudes without controlling other

predictors. Thus, it was questionable if the effect of race was the same when controlling for other predictors. Therefore, to verify the effect of race when controlling for other predictors, four separate models of multiple regression analysis were conducted—Antisocial Attitude Time 1, Antisocial Attitude Time 2, Program Attitude Time1, and Program Attitude Time 2. Predictors in each multiple regression model were race, status of sample, gender, military experience, employment, offense 1, offense 2, offense 3, prior adult arrest, prior adult conviction, alcohol use, drug use, education, income, age, and sentence length. Table 6 presents the results of multiple regression analysis.

Antisocial Attitude Model.

As presented in Table 6, R^2 statistics shows the predictability of each model. For the antisocial score, when all predictors were included together in one model, they can predict 25.4% (R^2 = .254) of variation of antisocial score in Time 1 model and 21.7% (R^2 = .217) of variation of antisocial score in Time 2 model. When considering each predictor in the models, race was not a significant predictor in both Time 1 and Time 2 model.

Table 6

Multiple Regression Analysis for Sample Characteristics and Scores on Antisocial Attitud and Program Attitude Scale: An Analysis for All Sample

PREDICTORS	Antisocial Attitude				Program Attitude			
	Time 1		Time 2		Time 1		Time 2	
	B	S.E.	B	S.E.	B	S.E.	B	S.E.
(Constant)	20.33	3.89	20.11	4.39	33.83	6.59	41.96	5.52
RACE (Caucasian, 1)	1.42	0.82	-0.70	0.90	2.34	1.35	2.13	1.16
SAMPLE (New, 1)	1.93	1.06	1.53	1.18	-0.43	1.79	-2.18	1.53
GENDER (Female,1)	**-2.71***	1.18	**-4.71***	1.30	1.68	1.91	**4.05***	1.64
MILITARY (Yes, 1)	-2.21	1.74	-0.72	1.91	-4.59	3.05	**-5.85***	2.61
EMPLOYED (Yes, 1)	0.74	1.10	-0.07	1.21	-0.83	1.86	-1.04	1.55
OFFENSE1(Violent,1)**	0.01	1.23	-0.12	1.35	-0.51	2.00	-0.51	1.79
OFFENSE2 (Drugs, 1)**	**1.83***	0.89	-0.02	0.99	-0.50	1.48	-2.15	1.25
OFFENSE3 (Other, 1)**	**2.34***	1.04	**3.04***	1.15	-1.91	1.71	-2.78	1.50
ARREST (Yes, 1)	0.57	1.01	0.46	1.13	**3.49***	1.69	1.15	1.42
CONVICT(Yes, 1)	-0.21	0.92	-0.81	1.01	-2.12	1.53	-0.69	1.33
ALCOHOL	0.05	0.27	-0.09	0.30	0.26	0.44	0.01	0.38
DRUG	**0.70***	0.26	0.54	0.28	0.06	0.43	0.25	0.36
EDUCATION	**-0.62***	0.25	-0.45	0.28	**1.08***	0.41	0.09	0.36
INCOME	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
AGE	-0.15	0.18	-0.10	0.20	0.17	0.31	0.33	0.26
SENTENCE	0.01	0.02	-0.01	0.02	-0.03	0.03	-0.01	0.03
R^2	0.254		0.217		0.134		0.223	
n	170		167		160		162	

* $p < .05$

** compared to property crime

Antisocial Attitude Time 1

Hypothesis 5: Before participating in boot camp, the antisocial attitude of Caucasian Americans and African Americans are different.

In Time 1 model, race was not a significant factor of antisocial attitudes. That is, given their socio-demographic and criminal characteristics, CA and AA were not different in term of their antisocial attitudes at the beginning of the program. Therefore, Hypothesis 5 was not supported. Instead, gender (B = -2.71), education (B = -.62), offense2 (B = 1.83), offense3 (B = 2.34), and drug use (B = .70) were significant predictors of antisocial attitudes at the beginning of the program.

Antisocial Attitude Time 2

Hypothesis 6: After participating in boot camp, the antisocial attitude of Caucasian Americans and African Americans are not different.

Antisocial Attitude Time 2 model can predict 21.7% of variation of antisocial score. The relation of race and antisocial attitudes in this model was not significant when controlling for other predictors. This finding implies that after participating in the program, the antisocial attitudes of CA and AA were not different. Thus, Hypothesis 6 was not supported. In this same model, however, gender (B = -4.71) and offense3 (B = 3.04) were significant predictors.

Program Attitude Model.

Given R^2 in Program Attitude model shown in Table 6, the predictability of the models was 13.4% (R^2 = .134) at Time 1 and 22.3% (R^2 = .223) at Time 2. It means that when including all predictors together in the same model, they can predict 13.4% of variation of program score at Time 1, and 22.3% of variation of program attitude at Time 2.

Program Attitude Time 1

Hypothesis 7: Before participating in boot camp, the attitude toward boot camp of Caucasian Americans and African Americans are different.

In Program Attitude Time 1 model, race was not a significant predictor of program attitude when controlling for other predictors, meaning CA and AA were not different in terms of their program attitude at the beginning of the program. Therefore, Hypothesis 7 was not supported by this finding. Only prior adult arrest (B = 3.49) and education (1.08) were significant with program attitude in this model. Program Attitude Time 1 model can predict 13.4% of variation of program score.

Program Attitude Time 2

Hypothesis 8: After participating in boot camp, the attitude toward boot camp of Caucasian Americans and African Americans are not different.

In Program Attitude Time 2 model, the relation between race and program attitudes was not significant when controlling for other predictors. That is, when controlling for their socio-demographic and criminal background, the attitudes about boot

camp of CA and AA were not significantly different. This finding is contrary to the finding from bivariate regression analysis presented in Table 2. The effect of race on program attitude at Time 2 disappeared when controlling for other predictors. Therefore, Hypothesis 8 was not supported. Gender (B = 4.05) and military (B= -5.85), on the other hand, were significantly related to program attitude in this model. Predictability of this model were 22.3% (R^2 = .223) of variation of program attitude.

The Multiple Regression Analysis : A Comparison of Caucasian Americans and African Americans.

From Table 6, multiple regression analysis revealed that race had no significant effect on both antisocial and program attitude scales when controlling for other predictors. Most previous research using race as a predictor stopped at this stage of the analysis in their examination of the effects of race on program outcomes. This might lead one to assume that race is not a significant predictor of program outcomes. However, it is possible that race may interact with other characteristics such as type of offense or employment; such an effect cannot be detected in models such as the one presented in Table 6. Therefore, even though the results from Table 6 indicate a non-significant effect of race when controlling for other predictors, another multiple regression models were conducted to examine if the relation between predictors and antisocial and program attitudes of CA and AA were different. Four multiple regression models were conducted for each ethnic group--Antisocial Attitude Time 1, Antisocial Attitude Time 2, Program Attitude Time 1, and Program Attitude Time 2. All socio-demographic and criminal characteristics were included the models. The results were presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Multiple Regression Analysis for Sample Characteristics and Scores on Antisocial Attitude and Program Attitude Scale : A Co
of Caucasian and African American

PREDICTORS	CAUCASIAN AMERICAN								AFRICAN AMERICAN							
	Antisocial Attitude				Program Attitude				Antisocial Attitude				Program Attitude			
	Time 1		Time 2		Time 1		Time 2		Time 1		Time 2		Time 1		Time 2	
	B	S.E.	B	S.E.	B	S.E.	B	S.E.	B	S.E.	B	S.E.	B	S.E.	B	S.E.
(Constant)	23.22	5.03	20.95	6.39	48.07	11.23	46.70	7.86	17.91	6.17	15.75	6.50	30.11	9.14	43.35	8.68
SAMPLE (New, 1)	2.41	1.23	2.78	1.58	-2.41	2.65	-3.28	2.01	1.58	1.83	-0.55	1.84	1.87	2.86	-0.81	2.53
GENDER (Female,1)	**-3.00***	1.23	**-4.96***	1.57	0.74	2.65	3.70	1.91	-2.61	2.32	**-4.76***	2.30	3.00	3.23	4.61	3.07
MILITARY (Yes, 1)	-1.36	2.34	-4.07	2.97	-1.31	5.07	-3.04	3.63	-2.46	2.76	1.80	2.76	-6.21	4.42	-6.02	4.27
EMPLOYED (Yes, 1)	0.43	1.43	2.57	1.83	-3.46	3.25	-2.22	2.22	1.16	1.85	-0.86	1.85	-1.43	2.69	0.10	2.50
OFFENSE1(Violent,1)**	-1.92	1.53	1.75	1.94	-3.87	3.26	-2.59	2.36	1.40	1.93	-1.17	1.92	2.12	2.72	-0.08	2.84
OFFENSE2 (Drugs, 1)**	0.19	1.28	1.26	1.63	-3.20	2.87	**-4.12***	1.98	2.45	1.28	-0.57	1.30	1.37	1.86	-1.76	1.71
OFFENSE3 (Other, 1)**	2.54	1.31	**4.65***	1.76	-4.70	2.86	-2.32	2.26	1.73	1.67	2.24	1.62	-0.84	2.35	-3.74	2.20
ARREST (Yes, 1)	-0.11	1.24	-1.89	1.57	**5.67***	2.67	**6.39***	1.91	1.66	1.60	2.33	1.67	3.14	2.35	-2.26	2.26
CONVICT(Yes, 1)	1.16	1.13	1.98	1.44	-2.49	2.43	**-4.93***	1.76	-1.69	1.44	-2.63	1.44	-1.91	2.09	1.86	2.05
ALCOHOL	-0.21	0.29	**-0.76***	0.38	0.32	0.65	-0.10	0.47	0.54	0.55	0.29	0.54	0.85	0.78	0.28	0.73
DRUG	**0.63***	0.29	0.56	0.37	-0.50	0.63	0.11	0.45	0.49	0.56	0.92	0.56	-0.09	0.82	0.15	0.74
EDUCATION	-0.45	0.29	**-0.81***	0.38	**1.40***	0.65	0.52	0.46	-0.59	0.41	-0.36	0.43	**1.21***	0.59	-0.03	0.59
INCOME	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
AGE	-0.21	0.26	-0.06	0.33	-0.44	0.58	0.05	0.40	-0.09	0.29	0.12	0.30	0.17	0.42	0.27	0.39
SENTENCE	-0.02	0.02	0.00	0.03	-0.06	0.05	-0.05	0.04	0.03	0.03	-0.03	0.03	-0.01	0.05	0.03	0.04
R^2	0.424		0.392		0.190		0.339		0.232		0.232		0.190		0.214	
n	77		76		74		75		93		91		86		87	

* $p < .05$

** compared to property crime

Caucasian American and Scores on Antisocial Attitude.

Table 7 shows that the predictability of Time 1 model was 42.4% (R^2 = .424) of variation of antisocial score. Gender (B = -3.00) and drug use (B = .63) were significant predictors. It means that Caucasian females who had less serious drug problem scored lower on antisocial scale than Caucasian males or females who had more serious drug problem.

Time 2 Model, on the other hand, can predict 39.2% (R^2 = .392) of variation of antisocial score. In this model, gender (B = -4.96), offense3 (B = 4.65), alcohol use (B = -.76), and education (B = -0.81) were significantly related to antisocial score. These statistics reveal that Caucasian females with higher education and more, convicted of property crime, and even though had more serious alcohol problem scored higher on antisocial score than Caucasian males or females who convicted of crime other than drugs and violent, had a lower education, and had less serious alcohol problem.

Caucasian American and Scores on Program Attitude.

According to Table 7, Program Attitude Time 1 model can predict 19.0% (R^2 = .190) of variation of program score. Two predictors were significant: arrest (B = 5.67) and education (B = 1.40). It means that Caucasian with higher education and had been arrested before scored higher on program score than Caucasian who had lower education and never been arrested. In other words, at the beginning of boot camp Caucasian with higher education and had been arrested before were more positive about the program.

When considering Time 2 Model, offense2 (B = -4.12), arrest (B = 6.39), and convict (B = -4.93) were significantly related to program score. The predictability of

Time 2 model was at 33.9% (R^2 = 33.9), meaning Time 2 model can predict 33.9% of variation of program score. The implication of this model is that Caucasian convicted of drug crime, had no prior arrest record, and had prior conviction scored lower than Caucasian convicted property crime, had prior arrest record, and had no prior conviction record. That is, Caucasian convicted of drug crime, had no prior arrest record and had prior conviction record were less positive about boot camp after graduation.

African American and Scores on Antisocial Attitude.

Table 7 shows that even though the Antisocial Attitude Time 1 model can predict 23.2% (R^2 = 23.2) of variation of antisocial score, none of predictors was significantly related to antisocial score.

In Time 2 model, gender (B = -4.76) was the only predictor that related to antisocial score. The negative relationship means that AA females who scored lower on antisocial score than AA males, indicating that AA females were less antisocial. This model predicts 23.2% (R2 = .232) of variation of antisocial score.

African American and Scores on Program Attitude

Program Attitude Time 1 model in Table 7 reveals that only education (B = 1.21) was significant with program score. The positive relationship implies that AA who had higher education scored higher on Program Attitude Scale than AA who had lower education. In other words, AA with higher education were more positive about boot camp. Given R^2 of .19, Time 1 model predicts 19.0% of variation of program score.

Additionally, as shown in Table 7, Time 2 model reveals the predictability of 21.4%. However, none of predictors I the model significantly related to program score.

Multiple regression analysis in Table 6 revealed that race had no significant effect on both antisocial and program attitudes when controlling for other predictors. As mentioned earlier, most previous research using race as a predictor stopped at this stage of their analysis. This led one to assume that race was not a significant predictor of program outcomes. In the present study, however, when examining the interaction between race and other predictors, the results provided more informative explanation about the effect of race on antisocial attitudes and program attitudes. As presented in Table 7, the results indicate that it was possible that race could interact with other characteristics such as gender and education and then affected samples' antisocial and program attitudes. Such an effect could not be detected in models such as the one presented in Table 6.

In contrast with Table 6, the results in Table 7 revealed race potentially affected antisocial and program attitudes of samples when it interacted with other socio-demographic and criminal characteristics. Apparently, CA and AA were different in terms of significant predictors of their antisocial and program attitudes. Most of the significant predictors in Table 6 remained significant in Table 7 for CA, whereas almost all the significant predictors of antisocial and program attitudes of AA disappeared. Overall, traditional predictors commonly used to look at the effects of the program were applicable only to Caucasian Americans and did not say any thing much for African American.

Gender and education were the only significant predictors of antisocial and program attitudes of AA. When race interacted with gender, AA females were less antisocial than AA males after participating in boot camp. This result was contrary to previous studies that boot camp was not appropriate for females to develop their positive attitudes. As for education, AA who had higher education were more positive about boot camp at the beginning of the program than those with lower or no education. In other words, the higher the education, the more positive about boot camp. After participating in boot camp, however, the average scores of African Americans on Program Attitude Scales decreased. Even though this change was not significant, it implies that boot camp did negatively affect some African Americans. Given these findings in terms of program implication, it is essential for boot camp administrators to recognize the difference in significant predictors of CA and AA antisocial and program attitudes. Results from Table 7 suggest that CA were more receptive to the program and sensitive to traditional predictors. The unchanged of attitudes of AA as indicated in this study may result from the fact that boot camp failed to address the different needs of AA. The implications of these findings were thoroughly discussed in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Antisocial and Program Attitude of Boot Camp Participants

This study was designed to examine the antisocial attitude of boot camp participants across ethnic groups. The author hypothesized that both Caucasian Americans and African Americans should positively change their attitude after participating in boot camp, and that the attitude of the two samples should be different given their socio-demographic and criminal background. As mentioned in Chapter II, there have been two major paradigms proposed to explain antisocial attitude of prisoners: Deprivation Model, and the Importation Model (MacKenzie & Souryal, 1993). The Deprivation Model emphasizes that the antisocial attitudes develop in response to environmental conditions. According to Deprivation Model, the difference between Caucasian American and African in term of their antisocial attitude in prison should not be minimal since they both are equally brutalized by prisons. Meanwhile, the Importation Model asserts that antisocial attitudes reflect the experience that offenders had before entering prisons. Prisoners "imported" these attitudes into prison rather than developed in response to deprivation atmosphere of prison. Given the reality in larger society, African American should be more violent or antisocial than Caucasian American. If the boot camp with its strict discipline and military-like atmosphere is viewed as a custody oriented settings, one would expect increased prisonization and antisocial attitudes. And there will not be much different between Caucasian American and African

American. On the other hand, some boot camp that provide therapeutic programs might expect less antisocial attitudes of inmates after they graduate.

When taken into consideration the components of South Carolina boot camp, the main goal of program was deterrence. However, there had been an increased focus on "rehabilitative" activities such as education and pre-release counseling. As a requirement, offenders placed in boot camp had to participate in these programs. In fact, offenders in South Carolina spent 4 hours every day in educational programs and 3 hours each week in drug education. Despite, since drug treatment program was not among the high priority goals, offenders spent little time in treatment. Given the overall program elements, the less antisocial attitude and the more positive about the program of South Carolina participants were expected in this study.

Given the difference between antisocial score at the beginning and at the end of the program, the results of this study show that general samples became less antisocial at the end of boot camp, even though their attitude toward boot camp program and staff did not significantly change over time. These findings are somewhat consistent with the study of MacKenzie and Souryal (1993). The evaluation of 8 boot camp programs insinuate that boot camp graduates became less antisocial and more positive about the program and the staff at the end of the program.

When examining Caucasian American and African American samples in separate models, evidences from the present study show that the antisocial attitude and program attitude of Caucasian offenders significantly changed overtime while African American did not significantly change theirs. Caucasian American became less antisocial and more positive about the program. These findings support previous study showing that some

rehabilitation programs were successful with some offenders (Andrews et. al., 1990; Antonowitz & Ross, 1994; Gendreau & Ross, 1987), and that prison may have some positive effects on particular group of inmates (Goodstien and Wright, 1989).

Since Caucasian American did change both attitudes over time while African American did not, one would expect that race might be a significant predictor of both antisocial attitude and program attitude; that is, Caucasian American and African American should be different in terms of their antisocial attitude and program attitude. However, when comparing the antisocial attitude and program attitude of Caucasian American and African, the results of multiple regression analysis indicate that their attitudes were not significantly different at any time given their socio-demographic and criminal background. These results were inconsistent with the assertion of Importation Model that African American should enter prison with more violent attitude was not supported.

Even though the statistics did not show the significant effects of race on antisocial attitudes and program attitudes for general samples, more in-depth examinations of Caucasian Americans and African Americans yield different results. That is, when race interacted with other socio-demographic and criminal characteristics, the antisocial attitudes and program attitudes of Caucasian Americans were somewhat different from African American. Apparently, traditional predictors commonly used in assessing programs and seem applicable only to Caucasians and did not really say anything for African Americans. The antisocial and program attitudes of Caucasian Americans were affected by gender, offense2, offense3, drug use, prior adult record, prior adult conviction, and education. Whereas, almost all socio-demographic and criminal

characteristics of African Americans were not significantly related to their antisocial and program attitudes. Only gender was significant with African Americans' s antisocial attitudes at Time 2, and education was significant with their program attitudes at Time 1. There are some explanations for these findings. Given the results of samples' characteristics analysis in the present study, it is possible that African Americans need to have higher qualifications than Caucasian Americans in order to be qualified for boot camp. For instance, they were older than Caucasian Americans, and had a higher education. They also had shorter length of sentence. This might make boot camp more punitive to African Americans than Caucasian Americans. Unsurprisingly, after they completed the program African Americans did not significantly change their attitudes about boot camp while Caucasian Americans became more positive.

Furthermore, the difference in the attitudes of African Americans and Caucasian Americans might result from the difference in their value orientation as discussed in Chapter II. Compared to Caucasian Americans, African Americans have a more communal and interdependent lifestyle, and presents stronger religious orientation (Robert, 1996). Previous research also suggest that high rates of violence among African Americans might stem from a subcultural value system, and the roots of this subcultural value might be socio-historical conditions of economic hardship and social isolation (Harer, 1996). According to Harer (1996), "blacks are more likely than whites to perceive situations or environments as being aggressive or dangerous...[and] these expectations of dangerousness lead to aggressive or violent responses aimed at protecting self or preventing retaliation."

Given the significance of education as a predictor of program attitudes when interacting with race, African American who had higher education were more positive about boot camp at the beginning of the program than those with lower or no education. This might be because African Americans with a higher education were more exposed to disciplines, rules, and norms of the large society. Thus, the education system might contribute to their receptive attitudes. These findings suggest that the higher the education, the more positive about boot camp. After participating in boot camp, however, the average scores of African Americans on Program Attitude Scales decreased. Even though this change was not significant, it implies that boot camp did negatively affect some African Americans. Therefore, in term of program implication, when designing rehabilitative elements for boot camp, it is essential for boot camp administrators to prioritize educational program that addressing the difference between African Americans and Caucasian Americans.

When race interacted with gender, results were consistent with previous studies that male and female offenders adjusted differently in boot camp. After participating in boot camp, both Caucasian and African American females became less antisocial than males. Namely, findings were contrary to previous studies that expecting females to be more negative and more stressful than males. Morash & Rucker, (1990) suggested that the environment of boot camp is not healthy for women to develop or improve their attitudes and behaviors. Male-dominant atmosphere and the emphasis on the masculinity cause women more stress. One possible explanation for a positive attitude of females in boot camp might be the relationship between female inmates and staffs. Previous study found that thoughtful, professional male drill instructors have been very effective with

women in the program (Clark, 1996). Evidences show a positive feedback from female boot camp graduates for their male drill instructor. In addition, female staff who are confident and clear about who they are as women are invaluable role models for female offenders.

Program administrators should consider gender difference issues along with race difference when designing the program for boot camp inmates. Researchers suggested that current eligibility criteria of boot camp, which originally were developed for men, limit the number of women in boot camp. Moreover, most of studies about boot camp addressed that the need to recognize the women's needs in rehabilitative programs that was overlooked by many programs in the past (Clark, 1996; Gowdy, 1996a; MacKenzie, Ellis, Simpson, & Skroban, 1996). Since the majority of female boot camp participants are mothers and have abusive relationships, Clark (1996) addressed that any boot camp program for women must focus on parenting, issues of abuse, and domestic violence. Health and nutrition are also equally needed. These programs have the potential to build self-esteem in women and help them to take a positive control of their lives.

When collecting the data for this study, MacKenzie and Souryal (1993) suggest that none of offenders thought that the boot camp was easy given the living conditions, strict discipline, and daily activities. Therefore, given the explanation of the Deprivation Model, the attitudes of samples should be more negative rather than positive. However, the present study found that Caucasian American significantly developed positive attitude toward program and staff after completing the program. Why so? Beside the explanation of Goodstien and Wright (1983) that prison might have some positive influence on some inmates, this might result from a Hawthorne effect since South Carolina boot camp was a

highly visible program and the participants knew they were being studied MacKenzie and Souryal (1993). When the data were collected, the researchers noticed that the program had committed staff who were vested in making boot camp "works". Interviews with samples revealed that staff were viewed as helpful and caring. This might be a possibility of why inmates develop positive toward program. Yet, if a positive program attitude was a result of Hawthorne effect, African American should have also had a positive program attitude. More in-depth study in the future should provide more informative answer.

Who Benefit from Boot Camp?

Even though the results reveal that the antisocial attitude of Caucasian and African American were not significantly different, there was a significant change in the attitudes of Caucasian American overtime. That is, Caucasians became less antisocial and more positive about the program. This might lead one to assume that Caucasian Americans benefit more from boot camp than African American. However, findings from the present study did not provide a clear answer whether or not these changes resulted from boot camp participation. Since original data were not originally collected for this study, some predictors that might have been used to examine the effect of the program were not found. Such predictors include race and gender of instructors, the relationship between offenders and instructor, and the number and types of treatment elements.

It should be noted that antisocial attitude per se is not necessarily a major factor that produces criminal behaviors (Andrews et. al, 1990). Being more antisocial alone does not mean that one will commit more crime or even has criminal behaviors. Rather,

as presented in this study, antisocial attitude were associated other criminogenic needs of offenders such as drug and alcohol use. When examining the interaction between race and substance abuse history, these predictors significantly related the antisocial attitudes of Caucasian offenders. These factors somehow encourage less antisocial individual to commit criminal activities just to support their habit. Failure to address these criminogenic needs in the program may results in the fact that the program does not help rehabilitate offenders at all. For example, most of the samples in this study reported having either drug or alcohol problem or both. Unfortunately, the primary goal of South Carolina boot camp was deterrence and did not focus on drug treatment program. Given this scenario, it was no surprise that general offenders did not change their attitudse toward program.

Future Research

The present study leads to some issues regarding boot camp program and boot camp participants. First of all, since the present study focused only on the antisocial attitude and program attitude of Caucasian and African American offenders in boot camp, the results do not provide the information on the level of antisocial attitude compared to those who were sentenced to other programs. Future research might address this issue by comparing the attitude of Caucasian and African American boot camp participants with those who are prison inmates, or probationers, or parolees.

Next, although results show that Caucasian American who graduated from boot camp became less antisocial and more positive about the program while African American did not change their attitude at all, there was no statistical evidence showing

what causes this change. Since it was not in the scope of this study, it would be premature to conclude that the change in antisocial of Caucasian resulted from the boot camp per se. Multivariate analysis controlling for potential predictors such as boot camp program elements, family background, and religion scale should provide more informative picture. Those potential predictors included. As stated in Chapter II, family background and religion beliefs of African Americans were quite different from Caucasian Americans. These might contribute to their antisocial attitudes and attitudes.

As for program elements, the future should address the issues of eligibility for boot camp, the relationship between offenders and staff, race of staff, and types and characteristics of therapeutic elements. Future research should examine if African Americans and Caucasian Americans differ in terms of their attitudes and behaviors when participating in particular programs within boot camp such as educational program and drug treatment.

Limitations of the Study

The use of secondary data has some limitations. Apparently, the author has no control over the data collection process. Also, since the data were not originally collected for this research purpose, some information that might help improve the quality of this study was not found such as the number of treatment programs in boot camp, characteristics of treatment program, and characteristics of program staff.

The generalizability is another problem of this research. The data used in this study was collected from particular settings with particular population. As discussed in Chapter I and II, boot camp programs vary from place to place especially in terms of

goals, focus of treatment, type of offender, setting environments, and participants' background. Therefore, findings of this study may or may not apply to boot camp graduates in general. One should use findings from this study cautiously when applying them to offenders from other settings.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

Items on Jessness Antisocial Attitude Scale

1. When you' re in trouble, it's best to keep quiet about it.
2. I get into a lot of fights.
3. If the police don't like you, they will try to get for anything.
4. Women seem more friendly than men.
5. Police stick their noses into a lot of things that none of their business.
6. I always like to hang around the same bunch of friends.
7. I hardly ever get a fair break.
8. A lot strange things happen to me.
9. If someone in your family gets into trouble, it's better for you to stick together than to tell the police.
10. It often seems like something bad happens when I'm trying my best to do what is right.
11. Most people in authority are bossy and overbearing.
12. It seems like wherever I am, I'd rather be somewhere lese.
13. I think that boys fourteen years old are old enough to smoke.
14. It makes me mad that some crooks get off free.
15. Police usually treat you dirty.
16. I often fell lonesome and sad.
17. A lot time I do think that my family me I shouldn't.

18. A lot of people say bad things behind my back.

19. It seems like people keep expecting me to get into some kind of trouble.

20. Other people are happier than I am.

21. Police and judges will tell you one thing and do another.

22. It doesn't seem wrong to steal from crooked storeowners.

23. My life at home is always happy.

24. Most police will try to help you.

25. Nobody seems to understand me or how I feel.

26. I don't mind lying if I'm in trouble.

27. I think my mother should have been stricter than she was about a lot of things.

28. I feel alone even when there are other poeole around me.

29. Things don't seem real to me.

30. I think there is something wrong with my mind.

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

Items on Program Attitude Scale

1. There is nothing in this place that will help me.
2. This place will not help me get a job.
3. I am tough enough to handle this place.
4. This experience will not change me.
5. This place will help me learn self-discipline.
6. The guard put on a big show, but that is all it is.
7. This place will never help me in any way.
8. I will learn things about myself here.
9. I am becoming a better person here.
10. The programs in this place will never help me in anyway.
11. I am becoming more mature here.
12. Because of my experience here, I will probably not get in trouble again.

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX C

Reliability Analysis for Program Attitude Scale from SPSS

R E L I A B I L I T Y A N A L Y S I S TIME 1 - S C A L E (A L P H A)

		Mean	Std Dev	Cases
1.	RE_P1	4.0218	1.2047	229.0
2.	RE_P2	3.3974	1.2405	229.0
3.	P3	4.2533	.9396	229.0
4.	RE_P4	4.0742	1.1989	229.0
5.	P5	4.1528	1.1271	229.0
6.	RE_P6	3.1266	1.3786	229.0
7.	RE_P7	4.1921	1.0504	229.0
8.	P8	4.0000	1.1002	229.0
9.	P9	4.0262	.9819	229.0
10.	RE_P10	4.1572	.9831	229.0
11.	P11	3.9476	1.0458	229.0
12.	P12	4.1703	1.1401	229.0

Correlation Matrix

	RE_P1	RE_P2	P3	RE_P4	P5
RE_P1	1.0000				
RE_P2	.3552	1.0000			
P3	-.0010	.0676	1.0000		
RE_P4	.3815	.2484	.1117	1.0000	
P5	.0169	-.0217	.2697	.1603	1.0000
RE_P6	-.0043	.1295	.0293	.2543	.1202
RE_P7	.3572	.2037	.2304	.5215	.2641
P8	.0728	.1414	.2291	.2527	.3218
P9	.1107	.0706	.2590	.3448	.3927
RE_P10	.3156	.1787	.0802	.4850	.1682
P11	.1854	.1378	.2769	.2060	.3603
P12	.0196	.0450	.0947	.1287	.2868

	RE_P6	RE_P7	P8	P9	RE_P10
RE_P6	1.0000				
RE_P7	.2345	1.0000			
P8	.1417	.2201	1.0000		
P9	.1628	.3523	.5115	1.0000	
RE_P10	.2377	.6163	.1784	.3501	1.0000
P11	.1811	.2727	.5222	.5779	.2683
P12	.1369	.1557	.3217	.4074	.1638

	P11	P12
P11	1.0000	
P12	.3827	1.0000

N of Cases = 229.0

Statistics for Scale	Mean	Variance	Std Dev	N of Variables
	47.5197	51.8647	7.2017	12

Item Means	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Max/Min	Variance
	3.9600	3.1266	4.2533	1.1266	1.3603	.1177

Item-total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
RE_P1	43.4978	45.5932	.2963	.3018	.7702
RE_P2	44.1223	45.9762	.2586	.1721	.7751
P3	43.2664	47.6261	.2587	.1601	.7712
RE_P4	43.4454	42.2569	.5242	.4036	.7438
P5	43.3668	44.9789	.3714	.2449	.7613
RE_P6	44.3930	45.0992	.2627	.1346	.7776
RE_P7	43.3275	42.7738	.5814	.5002	.7396
P8	43.5197	43.6981	.4782	.3691	.7499
P9	43.4934	43.2598	.5915	.4931	.7401
RE_P10	43.3624	44.1531	.5163	.4469	.7474
P11	43.5721	43.0617	.5617	.4656	.7417
P12	43.3493	45.2897	.3438	.2233	.7643

Reliability Coefficients 12 items

Alpha = .7729 Standardized item alpha = .7830

R E L I A B I L I T Y A N A L Y S I S TIME 2 - S C A L E (A L P H A)

		Mean	Std Dev	Cases
1.	RE_P1	4.0218	1.2047	229.0
2.	RE_P2	3.3974	1.2405	229.0
3.	P3	4.2533	.9396	229.0
4.	RE_P4	4.0742	1.1989	229.0
5.	P5	4.1528	1.1271	229.0
6.	RE_P6	3.1266	1.3786	229.0
7.	RE_P7	4.1921	1.0504	229.0
8.	P8	4.0000	1.1002	229.0
9.	P9	4.0262	.9819	229.0
10.	RE_P10	4.1572	.9831	229.0
11.	P11	3.9476	1.0458	229.0
12.	P12	4.1703	1.1401	229.0

Correlation Matrix

	RE_P1	RE_P2	P3	RE_P4	P5
RE_P1	1.0000				
RE_P2	.3552	1.0000			
P3	-.0010	.0676	1.0000		
RE_P4	.3815	.2484	.1117	1.0000	
P5	.0169	-.0217	.2697	.1603	1.0000
RE_P6	-.0043	.1295	.0293	.2543	.1202
RE_P7	.3572	.2037	.2304	.5215	.2641
P8	.0728	.1414	.2291	.2527	.3218
P9	.1107	.0706	.2590	.3448	.3927
RE_P10	.3156	.1787	.0802	.4850	.1682
P11	.1854	.1378	.2769	.2060	.3603
P12	.0196	.0450	.0947	.1287	.2868

	RE_P6	RE_P7	P8	P9	RE_P10
RE_P6	1.0000				
RE_P7	.2345	1.0000			
P8	.1417	.2201	1.0000		
P9	.1628	.3523	.5115	1.0000	
RE_P10	.2377	.6163	.1784	.3501	1.0000
P11	.1811	.2727	.5222	.5779	.2683
P12	.1369	.1557	.3217	.4074	.1638

	P11	P12
P11	1.0000	
P12	.3827	1.0000

N of Cases = 229.0

Statistics for Scale	Mean	Variance	Std Dev	N of Variables
	47.5197	51.8647	7.2017	12

Item Means	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Max/Min	Variance
	3.9600	3.1266	4.2533	1.1266	1.3603	.1177

Item-total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Alpha if Item Deleted
RE_P1	43.4978	45.5932	.2963	.3018	.7702
RE_P2	44.1223	45.9762	.2586	.1721	.7751
P3	43.2664	47.6261	.2587	.1601	.7712
RE_P4	43.4454	42.2569	.5242	.4036	.7438
P5	43.3668	44.9789	.3714	.2449	.7613
RE_P6	44.3930	45.0992	.2627	.1346	.7776
RE_P7	43.3275	42.7738	.5814	.5002	.7396
P8	43.5197	43.6981	.4782	.3691	.7499
P9	43.4934	43.2598	.5915	.4931	.7401
RE_P10	43.3624	44.1531	.5163	.4469	.7474
P11	43.5721	43.0617	.5617	.4656	.7417
P12	43.3493	45.2897	.3438	.2233	.7643

Reliability Coefficients 12 items

Alpha = .7729 Standardized item alpha = .7830

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, J. F., Dyson, L., & Burns. J. C. (1998). Boot camps: an intermediate sanction. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Andrews, D. A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R. D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F. T. (1990). Does correctional treatment works? A clinically-relevant and psychologically informed meta-analysis. Criminology, 28, 369-404.

American Correctional Association. (1995a). Standards for adult correctional boot camp programs. Laurel, MD: The Association.

American Correctional Association. (1995b). Standards for juvenile correctional boot camp programs. Laurel, MD: The Association.

Antonowitz, D. H., & Ross, R. R. (1994). Essential components of successful rehabilitation programs for offenders. International Journal of Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 38 (2), 97-104.

Austin, J., Jones, M., & Bolyard, M. (1993). The growing use of jail boot camps: the current state of art (Report No. NCJ 143708). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Austin, J., Jones, M., & Bolyard, M. (1996). A survey of jail-operated boot camps and guidelines for their implementation. In D. L. MacKenzie, & E. E. Hebert (Eds.), Correctional boot camps: a tough intermediate sanction (Report No. NCJ 157639, pp. 119-134). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Beers, B & Duval, C. (1996) The Oregon Summit Program. In A. Fins, M. Kelly, & M. Selby (Eds.), Juvenile and adult boot camps (pp.39-59). Upper Marlboro, MD: Graphic Communications.

Bottcher, J. & Isorena, T. (1996). First year evaluation of the California youth authority boot camp. In D. L. MacKenzie, & E. E. Hebert (Eds.), Correctional boot camps: a tough intermediate sanction (Report No. NCJ 157639, pp. 159-178). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Bourque, B. B., Cronin, R. C., Pearson, F. R., Felker, D. B., Han, M., & Hill, S. M. (1996). Boot camp for juvenile offenders: an implementation evaluation of three demonstration programs (Report No. NCJ 157316). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Bourque, B. B., Han, M., & Hill, S. M. (1996). A national survey of aftercare provisions for boot amp graduates (Report No. NCJ 157664). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1998). Probation and parole in the United State 1998 [On-line]. Available: http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/press/ppus98.pr

Cass, E. S. & Kaltenecker, N. (1996). The development and operation of juvenile boot camps in Florida. In D. L. MacKenzie, & E. E. Hebert (Eds.), Correctional boot camps: a tough intermediate sanction (Report No. NCJ 157639, pp. 179-190). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Clark, C. L. (1996). Sisters are doing it for themselves: Women in correctional boot camp. In A. Fins, M. Kelly, & M. Selby (Eds.), Juvenile and adults boot camps (pp. 309-320). Upper Marlboro, MD: Graphic Communications.

Clarck, C. L. & Aziz, D. W. (1996). Shock incarceration in New York State: Philosophy, results, and limitations. In D. L. MacKenzie, & E. E. Hebert (Eds.), Correctional boot camps: a tough intermediate sanction (Report No. NCJ 157639, pp. 39-68). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Cowles, E. L., & Castellano, T. C. (1995). Boot camp drug treatment and aftercare intervention: an evaluation review (Report No. NCJ 153918). Washington, DC: Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Cronin, R. C. (1994). Boot camps for adult and juvenile offenders: overview and update (Report No. NCJ 149175). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Ellis, D., Grasmick, H. G., & Gilman, B. (1974). Violence in prison: A sociological analysis. American Journal of Sociology, 80, 15-43.

Feld, B. C. (1981). A comparative analysis of organization structure and inmate subcultures in institutions for juvenile offenders. Crime and Delinquency, 27, 336-363.

Felker, D. B. & Bourque, B. B. (1996). The Development of boot camps in the juvenile justice system: Implementation of three demonstration programs. In D. L. MacKenzie, & E. E. Hebert (Eds.), Correctional boot camps: a tough intermediate sanction (Report No. NCJ 157639, pp. 143-158). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Gendreau, P., & Ross, R. R. (1987). Revivification of rehabilitation: Evidence from the 1980s. Justice Quarterly, 4, 349-408.

Goodstein, L. & Wright, K. N. (1989). Inmate adjustment to prison. In L. Goodstein & D. L. MacKenzie (Eds.), The American Prison Issue in Research and Policy. New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Gowdy, V. B. (1996a). A critical look at boot camps for women. In A. Fins, M. Kelly, & M. Selby (Eds.), Juvenile and adults boot camps (pp. 297-307). Upper Marlboro, MD: Graphic Communications.

Gowdy, V. B. (1996b). Historical Perspective. In D. L. MacKenzie, & E. E. Hebert (Eds.), Correctional boot camps: a tough intermediate sanction (Report No. NCJ 157639, pp. 1-38). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Grasmik, H. & Bursick, R. (1990). Conscious, significant others and rational choice: Extending the deterrence model. Law and Society Review, 24, 837-861.

Harer, M. D., & Steffensmeier, D. J. (1996). Race and prison violence. Criminology, 34 (3), 323-343.

Lotz, R., Regoli, R., & Raymond, R. (1978). Delinquency and special deterrence. Criminology, 15(4), 539-547.

MacKenzie, D. L., Elis, L. A., Simpson, S. S., & Skroban, S. B. (1996). Boot camp as an alternative for women. In D. L. MacKenzie, & E. E. Hebert (Eds.), Correctional boot camps: a tough intermediate sanction (Report No. NCJ 157639, pp. 233-244). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

MacKenzie, D. L., & Ballow, D. B. (1989). Shock incarceration programs in state correctional jurisdictions: an update (Report No. NCJ 120287). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

MacKenzie, D. L. & Souryal, C. (1993). Inmate attitude change during incarceration: A comparison of boot camp and traditional prison (A final report to the National Institute of Justice). College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

MacKenzie, D. L., & Piquero, A. (1994). The impact of schock incarceration program on prison crowding. Crime and Delinquency, 40, 222-249.

MacKenzie, D. L., & Sourya, C. (1994). Multisite evaluation of shock incarceration (Report No. NCJ 142462). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

MacKenzie, D. L., Shaw, J. W., & Gowdy, V. B. (1993). An evaluation of shock incarceration in Louisiana (Report No. NCJ 140567). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

McCampbell, S. W. (1996). A jail boot camp program: Broward Sheriff's Office. In A. Fins, M. Kelly, & M. Selby (Eds.), Juvenile and adult boot camps (pp.77-91). Upper Marlboro, MD: Graphic Communication.

Morash, M., & Rucker, L. (1990). A critical look at the idea of boot camp as a correctional reform. Crime and Delinquency, 36, 204-222.

Morash, M., Bynum, T. S., & Koons, B. A. (1998). Women offenders: Programming needs and promising approaches [On-line]. Available: http://www.ncjrs.org/txtfiles/171668.txt

Parent, D. G. (1989). Shock incarceration: An overview of existing programs. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Peters, M., Thomas, D., Zamberland, C., & Associates, C. (1997). Boot camps for juvenile of offenders: program Summary (Report No. NCJ 164258). Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Roberts, V. J. (1996). A exploratory analysis of Baldwin's Theory of Black Personality Development. Unpublished master's thesis, Michigan State University.

Siegel, L. J. & Senna, J. J. (1997) Juvenile delinquency: Theory, practice, and law (6th ed.). St. Paul, MN: West Publishing.

Tittle, C. R. (1980). Sanctions and social deviance. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Wordes, M., & Jones, S. M. (1998). Trends in juvenile detention and steps toward reform. Crime and Delinquency, 44, 544-560.

Wright, K. N. (1989). Race and economic marginality in explaining prison adjustment. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 26, 67-89.

Zachariah, J. K. (1996). An overview of boot camp goals, components, and Results. In D. L. MacKenzie, & E. E. Hebert (Eds.), Correctional boot camps: a tough intermediate sanction (Report No. NCJ 157639, pp. 17-38). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.