

1999


School-Based Juvenile Boot Camps: Evaluating Specialized Treatment and Rehabilitation (STAR)

Chad R. Trulson

Ruth Triplett

Old Dominion University, rtriplett@odu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/sociology_criminaljustice_fac_pubs

 Part of the [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Social Control, Law, Crime, and Deviance Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Trulson, Chad R. and Triplett, Ruth, "School-Based Juvenile Boot Camps: Evaluating Specialized Treatment and Rehabilitation (STAR)" (1999). *Sociology & Criminal Justice Faculty Publications*. 7.
https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/sociology_criminaljustice_fac_pubs/7

Original Publication Citation

Trulson, C. R., & Triplett, R. P. D. (1999). School-based juvenile boot camps: Evaluating Specialized Treatment and Rehabilitation (STAR). *Journal for Juvenile Justice & Detention Services*, 14(1), 19-44.

SCHOOL-BASED JUVENILE BOOT CAMPS: EVALUATING SPECIALIZED TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION (STAR)

by Chad R. Trulson and Ruth Triplett, Ph.D.

Specialized Treatment and Rehabilitation (STAR) is a unique and creative application of the juvenile boot camp concept. It is unique from "traditional" juvenile boot camps in that it is school-based, non-residential, and mandates parental participation. However, STAR maintains the boot camp atmosphere with its quasi-military structure and physical regimen. The present study examines the recidivistic outcomes of participants in STAR compared to a group of Intensive Supervision Probationers (ISP); both located in Conroe, Texas. Results of the recidivism analysis show at 12-months after concluding the program, 53 percent of STAR participants were re-arrested compared to 36 percent of ISP participants. Additionally, STAR participants were re-arrested 41 days sooner than ISP participants while being significantly more serious in their post-release offending. Implications and considerations for future research on juvenile boot camps are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

Recent episodes of violent juvenile crimes on school campuses, coupled with a general concern of juvenile offending has sparked a renewed interest on how to deal with juvenile offenders (Annual Report on School Safety, 1998; Bazemore and Day, 1996; Heaviside et al., 1998). Historically, the belief that juvenile offenders could be rehabilitated has driven policy in the juvenile justice system (see generally Lawrence, 1998, chapter 9; Platt, 1977; Rothman, 1980, p. 206-235). This outlook has not significantly changed today, although more and more support is appearing for increasingly punitive atmospheres to deal with youthful offenders (Krisberg, Currie, and Onck, 1998). Consequently, as juvenile detention facility populations soar to accommodate this punitive demand, correctional programs set within the community will handle the majority of juvenile offenders, with only the most persistent and violent receiving extended incarceration (Krisberg et al., 1998; Travis, Schwartz, and Clear, 1992).

Intermediate sanctions have evolved into a broad category of these community-based correctional programs and include intensive supervision, electronic monitoring, and house arrest (Cronin, 1994; Tonry, 1998). Touted as one of the most progressively growing and "exciting" intermediate pro-

grams for juvenile offenders, boot camps have garnered public approval and political support. This support comes from the perception of the boot camp as a tough punishment, which preserves the ideals of rehabilitation and diversion in a punitive atmosphere (Bourque et al., 1996, p. 2; MacKenzie and Parent, 1992; Osler, 1991; Sechrest, 1989; Tonry, 1998).

In fact, it is the mixture of punishment and rehabilitation that make boot camp programs appealing to almost all groups. The public and media are quick to approve of drill instructors screaming at disrespectful offenders; politicians embrace the idea of the "get tough" atmosphere; and correctional administrators, although skeptical, accept the boot camp as a needed correctional alternative (MacKenzie and Parent, 1992, p. 104; MacKenzie, Brame, McDowall, and Souryal, 1995, p. 327). Accordingly, it is because of the wide range of goals boot camp programs address that they "can be-at least in perception-all things to all people" (Cronin, 1994, p. 6).

Historical Progression of Modern Boot Camps

Even with the popular support and proliferation of the boot camp today, boot camps are not a new idea. The modern-day boot camp can be traced back to the turn of the 19th century to our nation's first penitentiaries. The Auburn and Elmira reformatories of the early 1800's used military structured lockstep marches, physical labor, silence, and discipline in the handling of prisoners (Morash and Rucker, 1990; Rothman, 1990). Continuing into World War II Britain, tenets of boot camps also prevailed. Due to the "lack of will" demonstrated by service men in combat, programs resembling boot camps provided the physical and psychological toughness needed to handle life-threatening situations (Salerno, 1994, p. 148).

More recent variations in these quasi-military modeled programs were initiated in the 1960's and continued into the early 1980's, though for the most part focusing on juvenile offenders (Parent, 1989; Salerno, 1994). These variations consisted of programs such as Outward Bound and Vision Quest, both of which were characterized by a mixture of laborious, exciting, and adventurous challenges, often times based in a wilderness setting (Bartollas, 1993; Parent, 1989). Similar programs from which the modern-day boot camp derives are Shock Probation and Scared Straight. These programs are characterized by "shocking" the offender into a productive and law-abiding life through shorts periods of unexpected incarceration, or "frightening" visits to the local penitentiary (Parent, 1989).

Scope of Boot Camp Programming

By coupling the elements of previous quasi-military programs (e.g., laborious, shock value) with a military based atmosphere of regimented drilling, physical activities, and a philosophy based on breaking and then building up the spirit, the modern-day boot camp as an intermediate sanction was born (Parent, 1989; Waldron, 1990). At last count, 33 adult correctional agencies were operating 49 adult boot camp programs in the United States, 13 jail systems were operating 15 programs, and 16 different state parole and probation agencies were operating or have planned 29 boot camp programs for 1998 (Camp and Camp, 1998). The total number of adult boot camp participants under any of the above jurisdictions totaled just over 12,000 individuals in 1998 (Camp and Camp, 1998).

In light of their relative infancy as a correctional alternative for juveniles, juvenile boot camps have matched this pace, comprising an additional 38 boot camps with estimates in excess of 10,000 participants (MacKenzie and Rosay, 1996, p. 95). However, these are conservative estimates of "reported" boot camps programs, noting that various other federal, state, county and local level programs are currently being planned and/or implemented with Federal funding support from entities such as the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) (FDJJ, 1997; Peters, Thomas, and Zamberlan, 1997).

Boot Camp Recidivism Evaluations

Included in the goals that boot camp programs are touted to address (e.g., cost savings, divert detention admissions, rehabilitation, enhance responsibility and self-esteem, etc.), none more so than recidivism reduction has been the "bottom-line" measure of success when evaluating boot camp performance (Benda, Toombs, and Whiteside, 1996, p. 243; Cronin, 1994; MacKenzie, 1990; MacKenzie et al., 1995; Maltz 1984, p. 1-6). Consequently, much of the evaluative research on boot camp programs has focused on the recidivistic outcomes of participants.

Recidivism evaluations, for both adults and juveniles, have indicated that boot camp programs are not the correctional panacea they are often touted to be, especially when compared to companion programs such as traditional probation or parole (MacKenzie et al., 1995; Peters et al., 1997; Sherman et al., 1998; Zhang, 1998). Evaluations conducted on participants of adult boot camps indicate at times they fare as well as their probation/parole comparison group (MacKenzie et al., 1995), while in others

they fare better (Benda et al., 1996; Clark, Aziz, and MacKenzie, 1994), and some do worse in terms of recidivism (MacKenzie et al., 1995; MacKenzie and Shaw, 1993). Much of the inconsistency in findings has been attributed to the varying degrees of program implementation, research designs, differing program philosophies (e.g., punitive as opposed to rehabilitative or therapeutic), and varying criteria of what constitutes success in the program (arrest free, adjudication free, violation free, completion of program, etc.).

Research on the success of juvenile boot camps is limited to a few studies, although the results thus far are similar to those for adults (Bourque et al., 1996; CYA, 1997; FDJJ, 1997; Peters et al., 1997). To date, one of the most comprehensive evaluations conducted on juvenile boot camps was initiated by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) in 1992, and was just recently completed (Peters et al., 1997). Findings garnered from the three pilot demonstration sites (Cleveland, Ohio; Denver, Colorado, and Mobile, Alabama) indicate that the boot camp participants improved their academic performance in two of the three sites (Peters et al., 1997, p. 19). In terms of cost savings, the boot camp was a cost-effective alternative to traditional confinement, but cost significantly more than probation (Peters et al., 1997, p. 24-25). While these findings are important, the bottom-line measure of program "success" was the post-release recidivistic outcomes of participants. Here, results of the analysis show that boot camp participants recidivated more often in two of the three sites, while participants in all three sites recidivated sooner on average than the control group (193.3 days to 237.3 days) (Peters et al., 1997, p. 21-24).

Additional juvenile boot camp evaluations have demonstrated more promising results; however, they have not produced dramatic reductions in recidivism compared to similar correctional programs. For example in California, evaluators of the Leadership, Esteem, Ability and Discipline (LEAD) boot camp program found that boot camp graduates followed for 12-24 months after program completion did not fare significantly better than the control group in terms of recidivism despite fewer post-release arrests (CYA 1997, p. 84). Similarly in Florida, despite "dramatic" gains in academic achievement and increased employment, participants of Bay County Sheriff's Juvenile Boot Camp did not fare significantly better in terms of post-release recidivism than their comparison group (FDJJ 1997, p. 27). Though additional juvenile boot camp programs are in operation, evaluative results on their effectiveness has not been completed or reported (see

Cass and Kaltenecker 1996; Poole and Slavick 1995; and Toby and Pearson 1992). Preliminary inquiry into the above programs has indicated improvements in academic performance, physical conditioning, and attitude change. However, these preliminary results could be an artifact of program compliance rather than a definitive or long term change in behavior.

Popular Acceptance of Boot Camp Programming

Despite the limited amount of information on juvenile boot camps and less on their "success," the idea of the boot camp structure as an appropriate setting for juvenile offenders has received increased support and attention (Bourque et al., 1996, p. 2; MacKenzie and Rosay, 1996; Osler, 1991; Waldron, 1991). This support continues to be advocated by the clarion call to "get tough" on juvenile offenders in the wake of serious juvenile crime, and more recently, incidences of violent crime on school campuses. Consequently, boot camp programs for juveniles, generally restricted to adjudicated offenders in the juvenile justice system, have now filtered into other entities such as school districts to attend to non-criminal and/or disruptive students (Brown, 1994; Kattner, 1996).

Given the continued interest in juvenile boot camps and the general lack of research on their effectiveness in reducing recidivism, it is vital that more information on juvenile boot camps is obtained in order to assess them as a viable option for juvenile offenders. Much in line with previous research on boot camp programs, this paper examines the recidivistic outcomes of participants in Specialized Treatment and Rehabilitation (STAR) compared to a similarly restricted group of Intensive Supervision Probation (ISP) participants. The paper begins with a program description focusing on the unique goals and structure of this innovative school-based program for adjudicated and non-adjudicated offenders. The paper concludes with a discussion of the implications for policy makers considering the boot camp as an option for juvenile offenders.

SPECIALIZED TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION (STAR)

Building on the structure and functions of previous boot camps for juveniles (e.g., quasi-military structure, residential, physical, etc.) STAR is a unique application of the boot camp concept. STAR deviates from traditional boot camps in a variety of ways. First, STAR is closely coupled with school jurisdictions, the juvenile court and correctional authorities. Second, STAR is non-residential, servicing status, misdemeanor, and felony

offenders. Third, STAR mandates parental participation. Demonstrating these characteristics, STAR is also the first juvenile boot camp "in the nation to be a non-residential program where offenders are returned to the custody of their parents each night," and the custody of their regular schools in the day (Kattner 1996, p. 26).

Goals of STAR

STAR was initiated out of a volunteer's concern for disruptive behavior on school campuses, the growing number of youths placed in the Texas Department of Criminal Justice Institutional Division (TDCJ-ID), and an interest in the development of a boot camp program for youth (Brown, 1994). In collaboration with the Conroe Independent School District (CISD), the Executive Director of Juvenile Services in Montgomery County, Texas, and the Juvenile Court, STAR began operation in November of 1993 (Brown, 1994).

At its initiation, the STAR program was designed to address a wide array of goals. These were to:

1. Enable individuals to remain in school while reducing their disruptive behavior.
2. Use school expulsion as a last resort after all other means have been attempted.
3. Improve the classroom and academic performance of its participants.
4. Coordinate a joint effort between the juvenile authorities and school jurisdictions.
5. Instill a sense of pride and discipline in participants.
6. Reduce the amount of criminal referrals to the juvenile authorities (Brown 1994, 5).

STAR Admission, Referrals and Sentencing

General admission criteria to the STAR program entail that the youth has been determined to "benefit from placement in a program that is a combination of a regimented discipline approach with an educational approach" (MCDSC STAR Handbook, 1994-1995, p. 2; referred to as STAR Handbook hereafter). All participants selected for STAR must also meet physical and mental health standards. These standards require that the youth not have a history of serious mental illness, heart or lung problems, any

serious medical complications (e.g., diabetes, gout, sickle cell, hemophilia, etc.). Participants must also have use of all major body systems (e.g., eyes, hands, feet, arms, legs, etc.) (STAR Handbook, 1994-1995, p. 10).

Table 1 shows the differing levels of STAR, the ages of admission, the lengths of sentence, as well as the referral source, and the degrees of parental involvement as of the 1994-1995 academic year. Table 1 indicates that STAR is focused on those youth that are at least 10 years old, not exceeding 16 at the time of sentence. The length of involvement in STAR is dependent on the STAR Level. Level I mandates one-day of STAR programming for those individuals referred by their school principal for misbehavior in school. This day is denoted as "prevent day" and occurs on Friday of each week. The referral process for prevent day simply entails the principal contacting the juvenile boot camp instructors and completing a disciplinary notice in the event of an infraction (e.g., disruptive on school bus). Parental involvement entails an agreement for the child to be placed in STAR for one-day of activity. Level II is a four-week diversion program for those youth that have committed a potentially detainable offense under the Texas Family Code (e.g., potentially detainable are offenses that are considered Class B misdemeanor and above). While not formally processed through the juvenile justice system, the youth are referred by the school principal to the boot camp drill instructors. Parental involvement at this level is an agreement for the child's placement, and a one-day parenting class. Youth at this level are those who generally have had no prior formal contact with the juvenile justice system.

The remaining two Levels, III and IV, represent substantial deviations from the first two. Level III is a 12-week deferred adjudication program for offenders who have committed a detainable offense. Offenses need not be school-based to be referred to STAR at this level. Referral to STAR at this level comes from the juvenile probation department with court acknowledgment and approval. Significant parental participation is involved at this level and consists of an agreement for youth placement in STAR, 20 hours of parenting classes, along with youth transportation to STAR. As the youth referred to STAR Level III have generally had some prior degree of formal contact with the juvenile justice system, they are formally processed, although offered STAR via the juvenile probation department through a deferred adjudication contract. Successful completion of STAR by this agreement and contract signifies the successful completion of probation requirements. Failure to complete the deferred adjudication agree-

ment entails modification of original deferred adjudication contract which can include adjudication and recycling back into the program at a higher level (STAR Handbook, 1994-1995, Appendix H).

The final level of STAR is Level IV. Level IV is a 24-week program, with sentencing from the juvenile court judge in which the child has been adjudicated delinquent. Much like STAR Level III, offenses need not be school-based to receive a referral to STAR at this level. Parental participation at this level entails an agreement for youth participation and 40 hours of parenting classes. This is the most restrictive level offered through STAR.

Table 1. STAR Program Criteria

STAR Levels	Ages	Length (weeks)	Referral Source	Parental Involvement
I	10-16	1 (day)	School Principal (misbehavior)	Agreement
II	10-16	4	School Principal (detainable offense)	Agreement and 1 day parenting classes
III	10-16	12	Juvenile Probation (deferred adjudication)	Agreement and 20 hours of parenting classes
IV	10-16	24	Juvenile Court (adjudicated)	Agreement and 40 hours of parenting classes (court mandated)

STAR Daily Schedule

The daily schedule of STAR is the same for all participants regardless of their level of involvement. Table 2 shows the daily regimen of STAR. Participants are to be at the specified alternative school for STAR participation at 5:30 a.m. Youth remain at this location for approximately two and a half hours, with this portion of the day being comprised of regimented drilling and physical activities. At 8:00 a.m. youths are bused to their regular schools, returning to the STAR location at 3:30 p.m. Participants then endure an additional two hours comprised of daily programming, cadence and drills. At 5:45 the STAR day ends (Kattner, 1996).

Table 2. STAR Daily Schedule

TIME	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY	SATURDAY
5:30-5:40 am	Roll Call	Roll Call	Roll Call	Roll Call	Roll Call	
5:40-5:50 am	Warm Up	Warm Up	Warm Up	Warm Up	Warm Up	
5:55-6:25 am	Stretching	Stretching	Stretching	Stretching	Stretching	
6:25-6:30 am	Break	Break	Break	Break	Break	
6:30-7:00 am	Drills	Drills	Drills	Drills	Drills	
7:00-7:30 am	Runs	Runs	Runs	Runs	Runs	
7:30-7:45 am	Showers	Showers	Showers	Showers	Showers	
7:45-7:50 am	Roll Call	Roll Call	Roll Call	Roll Call	Roll Call	
7:50-8:00 am	Transport To School	Transport To School	Transport To School	Transport To School	Transport To School	
8:00-3:30 pm	SCHOOL	SCHOOL	SCHOOL	SCHOOL	SCHOOL	9:00 am Community Service Depart
3:45-4:45 pm	Programming	Programming	Programming	Programming	Programming	
4:45-5:30 pm	Drills	Drills	Drills	Drills	Drills	
5:45 pm	Depart	Depart	Depart	Depart	Depart	

NOTE: information taken from STAR Handbook. Montgomery County Juvenile Services 1994-1995, p. 9.

Growth and Change of STAR

The present study focuses on the STAR program during the 1994-1995 school year. However, changes and adjustments have occurred in STAR, generally starting with the 1997-1998 academic year. Significant changes encompassed during this time mandate that all expelled students attend an approved alternative school instead of their regular schools (mandated by House Bill 133 in September of 1997). Additionally, STAR Level II was dropped from the program and Level I was continued only at the expense of the parents. STAR administrators also adopted an additional level (e.g., Level V), for those youth that have committed a detainable offense solely on school grounds. Level V entails 36 weeks of STAR programming and is operated under the auspices of the Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP). Despite these changes, the STAR program has remained largely unchanged (Trulson, 1998).

METHODOLOGY

Data

The data for the present study were obtained from the Montgomery County, Texas, Department of Community Supervision and Corrections (MCD CSC), located in Conroe, Texas. Approval for data collection was obtained from the Executive Director of the department through both verbal and written agreements. Approval was also obtained from the Director of the Department of Juvenile Services in Montgomery County.

Information on the boot camp structure, function and goals was garnered from authority interviews, qualitative observations, program manuals, and local media accounts of the STAR program. The data for the present study were collected from information maintained on youth history reports by detention and intake personnel at the MCD CSC Juvenile Service Division in Conroe, Texas which is located approximately forty minutes north of Houston, Texas. These reports provided a rich source of information on areas including but not limited to prior offending, prior contact with the probation department, school progress, and previous juvenile detention admissions.

Samples

STAR

The present evaluation focuses on STAR participants who were mandated to either the 12 or 24-week STAR program between January of 1995 through July of 1997. The present study excludes analysis of 1-day and 4-week STAR participants because sufficient data was not available for school referred youth (more detailed information is collected on those who are formally processed or on deferred adjudication through the juvenile court and/or probation department-e.g., Level III and IV). The beginning date of January of 1995 was used to allow for program adjustments and modifications since the inception of STAR in November of 1993. July of 1997 was chosen as a cut-off date to allow for an adequate follow-up period. Using these dates allowed for offenders who were sentenced to and completed the STAR program to be followed up for a period of 12-months after the conclusion of their program. Using these parameters, the final STAR sample consisted of 94 participants.

Termination from STAR

As STAR is an intensive program offered in lieu of a much longer sentence (in most cases involving STAR Level III and IV) most youth accept the stipulations and complete the program. In addition, most youth will finish the program even in the event of non-compliance or offending. In the present study, 99 youth were originally identified as participants of STAR Level III and IV between January of 1995 and July of 1997. Of those 99 identified, 5 were dismissed from the STAR Program (the dismissals are not provided in tabular form). Three of those dismissals were sent to the Texas Youth Commission (TYC) for unspecified reasons, 1 was sent to a drug rehabilitation center, and 1 outcome was unknown and/or not reported. Additionally, of the remaining 94 STAR participants that finished the program, 29 actually offended in the program, with 8 of these being a felony offense. The remaining 21 in-program offenders were divided among 6 misdemeanor offenses and 15 violations of STAR contract or court order (we did not have sufficient data on minor infractions as these are generally informally handled see STAR Handbook, 1994-1995, p. 4- "Extra Supervised Instruction"). The most plausible explanation for the lack of dismissal in the event of program offending is the "recycling" option mentioned earlier. Clearly, termination from the STAR program is not automatic based on the commission of an offense and appears to be based largely on subjective criteria of the probation department and/or juvenile court judge.

ISP

The comparison group in the present study are Intensive Supervision Probationers (ISP). Offenders sentenced to this program were usually judged to be suitable for the boot camp in terms of their demographic background, offense characteristics, and criminal histories, but for various unspecified reasons were not placed in STAR (Probation Supervisor, personal communication, June 1998). For example, it may be that the ISP youth were qualified for STAR placement based upon their current or previous criminal history, but did not meet the physical and/or mental health standards. It is also plausible that parental cooperation (e.g., parenting classes, transportation of child, parental agreement for placement) was not obtained thus preventing STAR placement.

As with STAR, participants of ISP are court-mandated to this program for a period ranging from 12-weeks to 24-weeks with the possibility of

extensions, however, unlike STAR only adjudicated offenders are sentenced to ISP. Much like STAR participants, ISP youth are supervised on a daily basis either through parental oversight, direct reporting, telephone contact, or field visits from the probation staff. ISP youth are also required to perform community service, as well as attend the various programs offered by Montgomery County Juvenile Services. While ISP participants are not selected through any random, scientific or objective process, ISP participants generally represent those offenders who have exhausted all other sentencing alternatives. Accordingly, those offenders who fail at ISP are either mandated to lengthier sentences, or are remanded to the Texas Youth Commission (TYC).

To determine those who were sentenced to ISP between January of 1995 and July of 1997, a computer assisted database maintained by Montgomery County Juvenile Services was utilized. This resulted in a final sample of 92 ISP participants matched aggregately to the STAR sample on criteria of age, gender, and race (Maxfield and Babbie, 1998, p. 163). These participants were followed for a period of 12-months concluding the completion of their programming.

Termination from ISP

The sample of ISP participants identified in the original matching consisted of 95 participants. Of these 95 identified, 3 did not complete the program. Of the three youth that did not complete the program, 2 were remanded to the TYC for unspecified reasons, while the remaining youth was waived to adult court on a capital murder charge. Much like STAR, individuals in ISP appeared to have considerable opportunities to "successfully" complete the program. Results of program performance (not in tabular form) of the ISP participants indicate that of the 92 participants, 29 individuals offended in the program. Of these in-program offenses, 8 were felony offenses, 12 were misdemeanor offenses, and 9 were considered violations of a court order. The differences between the STAR in-program offenders and ISP in-program offenders were not statistically significant on any criteria (e.g., number of program arrests, offense type of program arrest, seriousness score, days until program arrest) (see Trulson, 1998, p. 84).

Measures

The measures in the present study are divided into three categories or

sets of variables. They are pre-program demographic variables; criminal history variables, and post-release recidivism variables. Pre-program demographic variables include age at program admission, race, gender, years of education, school progress, gang involvement, abuse history and living arrangements. Criminal history variables provide information on areas of age at first arrest, number of prior arrests, offense at first arrest, most serious prior arrest, prior detention days, and prior supervision programs.

The final set of measures are the post-release recidivism outcomes of STAR and ISP participants. The measure of success or failure in the present study is recidivism by re-arrest, while paying particular attention to the type and seriousness of the arrests. The post-release outcome measures were defined as the number of arrests at 6 and 12-months, the number of days from program release to a new arrest, and the seriousness of those arrests. In terms of seriousness, an offense seriousness scale was configured from Wiebush (1993, p. 86) and adapted to Texas' Penal Code to aggregate measure the pre-program and post-release seriousness of participant arrests (see Appendix A; serious scores were based on one offense: the most serious pre-program arrest and the most serious post-release arrest). Using the two different measures of recidivism (e.g., frequency and seriousness) the present study captures how often participants offended in the 12-month follow up period, as well as empirically differentiating between the various levels of offending (e.g., probation violation, status, felonyX vs. felonyS, misdemeanor, etc.).

Analyses

Bi-variate analyses are conducted using chi-square tests of significance using percentages from categorical and/or dichotomous level variables for examining group differences. Student t-tests examining significant differences in continuous variable averages among the two groups are also conducted.

The results of the analyses are presented in the tables indicating the frequencies/ averages/ percentages as found based on the metric of the variable. Differences among the groups (e.g., STAR and ISP) are reported along with the corresponding significance levels.

FINDINGS

Bi-Variate Comparisons of STAR and ISP Participants

Table 3 presents the pre-program demographic comparisons of STAR and ISP participants. Table 3 indicates that the vast majority of participants in either program are male (94.7% STAR vs. 89.1% ISP). Only 15 of the 186 total participants are female, 5 from STAR and 10 from ISP. Racially, whites make up 66.0% of the STAR sample and 81.5% of the ISP sample. Black participants made up 13.8% of STAR and 6.5% of ISP, with

Table 3. Pre-Program Comparisons of STAR and ISP Participants

VARIABLES	STAR		ISP	
	N	Mean/%	N	Mean/%
Sample Size	94	100%	92	100%
Age at Program Admission*	94	14.5	92	15.2
Race	94		92	
⇒ Black	13	13.8%	6	6.5%
⇒ White	62	66.0%	75	81.5%
⇒ Hispanic	19	20.2%	11	12.0%
Gender	94		92	
⇒ Male	89	94.7%	82	89.1%
⇒ Female	5	5.3%	10	10.9%
Child Lives With	92		89	
⇒ Both Parents	24	26.1%	22	24.7%
⇒ Mother Only	34	37.0%	30	33.7%
⇒ Father Only	4	4.3%	9	9.0%
⇒ Other	30	32.6%	29	32.6%
Years of Education**	91	8.86	83	9.39
Child Failing in School	91		90	
⇒ No	68	74.7%	68	75.6%
⇒ Yes	23	25.3%	22	24.4%
Child Behind in School	90		82	
⇒ No	46	51.1%	40	48.8%
⇒ Yes	44	48.9%	42	51.2%
Child Gang Related	93		92	
⇒ No	82	88.2%	82	89.1%
⇒ Yes	11	11.8%	10	10.9%
Child Abuse Suspected	94		92	
⇒ No	90	95.7%	88	95.7%
⇒ Yes	4	4.3%	4	4.3%
Child a Substance Abuser	94		92	
⇒ No	70	74.5%	66	71.7%
⇒ Yes	24	25.5%	26	28.3%

NOTE: Number of applicable cases in bold. Totals not equaling sample size are indicative of missing cases, information or inapplicable cases.

* $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$

Hispanics constituting the remainder of participants (20.2% STAR vs. 12.0% ISP). STAR participants were found to be significantly younger than ISP participants, finding those in STAR about one year younger on average (14.5 STAR vs. 15.2 ISP) (see Table 3). Consistent with the differences in age, STAR participants differed significantly from ISP participants in years of schooling completed, finding ISP participants to have completed almost one year more in their schooling (8.86 STAR vs. 9.39 ISP).

Criminal history comparisons show several statistically significant differences between the groups (see Table 4). The results of the analysis show that STAR participants are on average younger than ISP participants at first arrest (13.6 STAR vs. 14.2 ISP); are less likely to have had a felony at first arrest (39.4% STAR vs. 63.0% ISP), and are less likely to have a felony as their most serious prior arrest (62.8% STAR vs. 91.3% ISP). Additionally, STAR participants had fewer arrests for person related crimes than ISP (21.3% STAR vs. 25.0% ISP), and fewer property related crimes (51.1% STAR vs. 67.4% ISP), although they had significantly more "other" crimes

Table 4. Criminal History Comparisons of STAR and ISP Participants

VARIABLES	STAR		ISP	
	N	Mean/%	N	Mean/%
Sample Size	94	100%	92	100%
Age at First Arrest**	94	13.6	92	14.2
Offense at First Arrest***	94		92	
⇒ Felony	37	39.4%	58	63.0%
⇒ Misdemeanor	53	56.4%	25	27.2%
⇒ Status	4	4.3%	9	9.8%
Number of Prior Arrests	94	3.1	92	3.2
Most Serious Prior Arrest***	94		92	
⇒ Felony	59	62.8%	84	91.3%
⇒ Misdemeanor	35	37.2%	8	8.7%
Offense Type at Most Serious Prior Arrest**	94		92	
⇒ Person	20	21.3%	23	25.0%
⇒ Property	48	51.1%	67	67.4%
⇒ Other	26	27.7%	7	7.6%
Child Ever in Juvenile Detention*	94		92	
⇒ No	40	42.6%	23	25.0%
⇒ Yes	54	57.4%	69	75.0%
Prior Days in Juvenile Detention*	54	25.9	69	17.4
Number of Prior Supervision Programs	30	1.4	12	1.3
Offense Seriousness Score***	94	4.8	92	5.6

NOTE: Number of applicable cases in bold. Totals not equaling sample size are indicative of missing cases, information or inapplicable cases.

* $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$

(e.g., drug violations, deadly conduct, engaging in organized criminal activity, and weapons violations) (27.7% STAR vs. 7.6% ISP). ISP participants were significantly more likely to be placed in a prior detention setting (57.4% STAR vs. 75.0% ISP), although they spent, on average, fewer days in detention compared to STAR participants (25.9 STAR vs. 17.4 ISP (days). Based upon the offense seriousness score between the groups on their most serious prior offense, ISP participants were significantly more serious offenders than STAR participants (4.8 STAR vs. 5.6 ISP).

At the heart of the evaluation are the recidivistic outcomes of STAR participants compared to the ISP participants. Table 5 shows the post-release outcomes (e.g., re-arrest and types of offending) of STAR and ISP participants. Results of the recidivism analysis are broken down into two intervals. These intervals denote the number of STAR and ISP participants arrested at 6-months and 12-months concluding program treatment (see Table 5).

Results of the analysis show that 6-months after release from the program the number of arrests on average between STAR and ISP participants did not significantly differ. However at 12-months, the results indicate significant differences in the number of arrests (see Table 5). Here, 53 percent of the STAR participants were re-arrested on average 2.1 times compared to 36 percent of the ISP participants re-arrested on average 1.6 times. In terms of the days until a new arrest, STAR participants were arrested significantly sooner than their ISP counterparts (95.0 STAR vs. 136.5 ISP (days until a new arrest). STAR participants were also found to be significantly more serious in their offending as compared to ISP participants at both the 6-month and 12-month follow-up interval (3.8 STAR vs. 2.3 ISP 6-months) (3.9 STAR vs. 2.9 ISP 12-months).

DISCUSSION

Intermediate correctional programs, and more specifically boot camps, have developed at federal, state, and local levels at an unprecedented pace. Historically reserved for adult offenders, the present growth of the boot camp as a viable option for juvenile offenders only emphasizes the degree of truth in that statement. Yet while more and more juveniles are subjected to the rigors of the boot camp experience, empirical research evaluating their effectiveness is limited. What has been done suggests that boot camps are no more effective than traditional correctional methods, such as proba-

Table 5. Pre-Program Comparisons of STAR and ISP Participants

VARIABLES	STAR		ISP	
	N	Mean/%	N	Mean/%
Sample Size	94	100%	92	100%
Days in Program**	94	112.4	92	137.2
6-Month Arrests	44	1.7	20	1.6
12-Month Arrests*	50	2.1	33	1.6
Most Serious Subsequent Arrest at 6-Months	44		20	
⇒ Felony	19	43.2%	3	15.0%
⇒ Misdemeanor	12	27.3%	6	30.0%
⇒ Violation	13	29.5%	11	55.0%
Most Serious Subsequent Arrest at 12-Months*	50		33	
⇒ Felony	23	46.0%	10	30.3%
⇒ Misdemeanor	17	34.0%	7	21.2%
⇒ Violation	10	20.0%	16	48.5%
Offense Type at Most Serious Subsequent 6-Month Arrest*	44		20	
⇒ Person	11	25.0%	1	5.0%
⇒ Property	16	36.4%	5	25.0%
⇒ Other	17	38.6%	14	70.0%
Offense Type at Most Serious Subsequent 12-Month Arrest**	50		33	
⇒ Person	16	32.0%	3	9.0%
⇒ Property	20	40.0%	10	30.3%
⇒ Other	14	28.0%	20	60.6%
Days Until a New Arrest*	50	95.0	33	136.5
Child Placed in Detention	94		92	
⇒ No	57	60.6%	66	71.7%
⇒ Yes	37	39.4%	26	28.3%
Subsequent Days in Detention	37	37.2	26	26.5
Offense Seriousness Score				
⇒ 6-Months**	44	3.8	20	2.3
⇒ 12-Months*	50	3.9	33	2.9

NOTE: Number of applicable cases in bold. Totals not equating sample size are indicative of missing information or inapplicable cases (e.g., some youth were not re-arrested at all).

* $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$; *** $p \leq .001$

tion and/or parole, in reducing recidivism (Sherman et al., 1998).

In the present study we sought to examine the STAR program and its potential for reducing recidivism compared to a similarly structured ISP program. Overall, the findings of the present study parallel those from other juvenile boot camp program evaluations. The STAR program is not overwhelmingly more or less effective than the ISP program to which it was compared. In the present study it was found that the STAR partici-

pants, who were less serious at the onset of their program, actually offended significantly more times, for more serious offenses, and sooner than their ISP comparison group. Here it was shown that 53 percent of those in STAR re-offended compared to only 36 percent of the ISP sample (50 STAR vs. 33 ISP). Despite this, the results of the analysis also indicated that while approximately half of the STAR participants re-offended, the other half were successful, a finding common in correctional studies (Travis et al., 1992).

To draw meaningful conclusions from the findings of the present study some cautions should be noted. First, because the study was quasi-experimental in nature and the subjects were not randomly selected from their respective groups, the differences in recidivistic outcomes could be attributable to the types of offenders rather than the program effect. Efforts were made (e.g., aggregate matching) to match the participants of each program as closely as possible but unfortunately the low number of offenders sentenced to STAR and ISP each year prevented more detailed matching needed to eliminate possible non-equivalent group effects. Because of the lack of randomization in program referral, sample selection, and the different types of offenders that the respective programs service, the group of ISP participants were found to be statistically more serious before their program entrance compared to STAR participants. ISP participants were also almost one year older than STAR participants at program admission even though STAR participants on average were arrested (e.g., began offending) almost one year earlier chronologically than the sample of ISP participants. In light of these group characteristics, the fact that the more serious ISP participants actually offended significantly less than the less serious STAR participants may indicate effects of the non-equivalent group design, or maturation in the ISP sample. More specifically, because of the older age of ISP participants they may have been on a declining pattern of offending, while STAR participants might still have been inclining in their offending. To the extent that this is the case is only speculative and was not gauged in the present study. Furthermore, it is plausible to note that the comparative success of the ISP group may be explained by the fact that for most participants, ISP is a "last chance" alternative and failure in ISP may mean commitment to the TYC for an indeterminate sentence or substantive extensions in sentence. Again the above are only speculative but should be taken into consideration when interpreting the findings.

Additionally, it should be noted that even though both the STAR and

ISP programs are supervision intensive, it may be that the STAR program actually provided for more intense supervision and a greater chance at detection during and after programming. In the ISP program participants are relegated to weekly face to face collateral contact with field officers, community service, random field visits and telephone contact. Although ISP is considered intensive compared to traditional probation, STAR participants are under direct supervision on STAR grounds or in school from 5:30 am until 6:00 p.m. in the evening. STAR participants are also "known" to probation authorities, law enforcement officers and school staff alike, not only through reputation or referral, but by their outward appearance of shaved heads, quasi-military garb, and STAR insignias. Additionally, STAR participants are also in an atmosphere which may tend to create "frustration" and at times lead to rule violations or criminal violations (there was evidence that in-program rule violations for STAR participants did include instances of staff assault and/or participant assault by other participants). Furthermore, as successful STAR participation entails considerable commitment by the parents as well (e.g., transportation on time, reporting of child rule breaking), failure by the parents to maintain compliance may reflect on the youth as well (e.g., youth obtained a violation because of lack of transportation by parents). To the extent these factors influenced the effectiveness of the program and ultimately the post-release recidivism outcomes of STAR participants are unknown but should be considered.

Despite the concerns above, there are a number of important issues raised by the findings that merit discussion. The first issue concerns the length of time (e.g., 1-day to 24-weeks) sentenced to the program. Of particular concern to this observation are the "rehabilitative" goals of STAR and if they can be accomplished in a period of 1-day, or for that matter 24-weeks. A more extreme consideration for STAR is to recognize that this is a relatively short time, and not to expect utopian results. An implication for future STAR programming would be to pay special attention to the program efforts within this time frame and ensure they are conducive to the program goals.

Closely coupled to the in-program efforts of boot camp programs are the efforts after programming. Prior research has demonstrated the importance of aftercare in boot camps, although this area was somewhat unclear for the STAR program (Cronin, 1994; Hengesh, 1991; Zhang, 1998; Trulson, 1998). In the STAR program, the aftercare component appeared to consist of supervisory and control functions (e.g., drug testing, reporting, commu-

nity service, etc.) instead of "traditional" re-socialization functions such as chemical dependency counseling, behavior management, academic assistance and the like. Without these considerations, research has noted that sending individuals back into the same environment with the same problems from which they came is a preparation for failure (Cowles and Castellano, 1995; Hengesh, 1991).

Finally, while STAR participants fared no better than ISP participants, almost half of STAR participants were arrest free during the 12-month follow-up period of this study. This raises two important questions. What would have happened to the 94 12 and 24-week participants had STAR not been around? Would these individuals have received a lesser sanction, or alternatively, would they have been sent to the Texas Youth Commission (TYC) for an indeterminate amount of time? If the latter is true, undoubtedly the STAR program has benefited the 44 youth that did not re-offend within 12-months after their programming. If the former is true, the implication is that STAR may be widening the correctional net on marginal individuals, especially the 44 successes, who might not have re-offended if given a lesser sanction or none at all. While these questions were not empirically examined in the present study, they are important questions to ask when assessing boot camp program performance measures.

CONCLUSIONS

Even with the limited amount of success garnered from juvenile boot camps, their appeal as a program that can "pursue rehabilitative goals in an environment that does not appear to coddle delinquents" will ensure their popularity in the near future (Bourque et al., 1996, p. 103). Furthermore, due to the real or perceived rise in juvenile crime and more serious incidences of juvenile offending, the boot camp will continue to offer a particularly fitting and popular sanction for juvenile offenders.

At the present time, correctional officials operating or planning boot camp programs have not had access to a considerable amount of information concerning the essential or effective components that equal boot camp success for juvenile offenders. What is known is that juvenile boot camp programming, adapted closely from adult programming models, varies widely in terms of the scope, philosophy, length, goals, and aftercare. Consequently, some boot camp programs for juveniles espouse rehabilitation, others a desire for punishment, while a significant portion want to accom-

plish these goals simultaneously (MacKenzie and Rosay, 1996, p. 107). Some service only serious offenders for a nominal amount of time, while others like STAR run the gamut from school rule violators through felony offenders for periods ranging from one-day to 24-weeks; all in a comparative regimen. As for aftercare, a variety of juvenile boot camps provide for this component, however the goals of aftercare vary from detection and supervision functions to treatment and counseling (Hengesh, 1991; MacKenzie and Rosay, 1996, p. 114).

Much like the outcomes experienced in the adult arena, evaluations on juvenile boot camp programs, though still very limited in number, have not offered a definitive answer to the age-old question of "what works?" At the present time the most feasible answer to that question is that we do not know. What is effective in one program may not be effective in others because of differing standards, goals, philosophies and selected participants. It is in this context that future research should focus on identifying the types of offenders, and the types of boot camps that are producing the results that these programs were developed to garner. Only by identifying the common factors that indicate effectiveness in juvenile boot camps can we attempt to answer the question of "what works, what doesn't, and what's promising" (Sherman et al., 1998).

REFERENCES

- Annual Report on School Safety*. (1998). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice: Author.
- Bartollas, C. (1993). *Juvenile delinquency, 3rd edition*. New York: Macmillan.
- Bazemore, G., and Day, S. (1996). *Restoring the balance: Juvenile and community justice*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Benda, B., Toombs, N., and Whiteside, L. (1996). Recidivism among boot camp graduates: A comparison of drug offenders to other offenders. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 24 (3), 241-253.
- Bonta, J., and Motiuk, L. (1990). Classification to halfway houses: A quasi experimental evaluation. *Criminology*, 28 (3), 497-506.
- Bourque, B., Cronin, R., Pearson, F., Felker, D., Han, M., and Hill, S. (1996). *Boot camps for juvenile offenders: An implementation evaluation of three demonstration programs*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Brown, M. (1994). Specialized treatment and rehabilitation project: A different approach to the boot camp concept. *NJDA News*, 7 (1), 2-6.

- Camp, C., and Camp, G. (1998). *The corrections yearbook 1998*. Connecticut: Criminal Justice Institute.
- Cass, E., and Kaltenecker, N. (1996). The development and operation of juvenile boot camps in Florida. In *Correctional boot camps: A tough intermediate sanction*. Edited by D. Mackenzie and E. Herbert. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Clark, C., Aziz, D., and MacKenzie, D. (1994). *Shock incarceration in New York*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Cowles, E., and Castellano, T. (1995). *Boot camp drug treatment and aftercare intervention: An evaluation review. A final summary report to the National Institute of Justice*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Cronin, R. (1994). *Boot camps for adult and juvenile offenders: Overview and update*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- (CYA) California Department of the Youth Authority. (1996). *LEAD: A boot camp and intensive parole program. An impact evaluation: Second year findings*. Sacramento, CA: Author.
- (FDJJ) Florida Department of Juvenile Justice. (1997). *Bay county sheriff's office juvenile boot camp: A follow-up study of the first seven platoons*. Bureau of Data and Research. Tallahassee, FL: Author.
- Heaviside, S., Rowand, C., Williams, C., and Farris, E. (1998). *Violence and discipline problems in U.S. public schools: 1996-1997*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.
- Hengesh, D. (1991). Think of boot camps as a foundation for change, not an instant cure. *Federal Probation*, 106-108.
- Kattner, C. (1996). Keeping juvenile offenders in school and in their homes while rehabilitating them. *Middle School Journal*, 26-32.
- Krisberg, B., Currie, E., and Onek, D. (1998). "What works with juvenile offenders: A review of "graduated sanctions" programs." In *Community corrections: Probation, parole, and intermediate sanctions*, pp. 96-110. Edited by J. Petersilia. New York: Oxford University Press
- Lawrence, R. (1998). *School crime and juvenile justice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- MacKenzie, D. (1990). Boot camp prisons: Components, evaluations, and empirical issues. *Federal Probation*, 54 (3), 44-52.
- MacKenzie, D., and Parent, D. (1992). Boot camp prisons for young offenders. In *Smart sentencing: The emergence of intermediate sanctions*, pp. 103-123. Edited by J. Byrne, A. Lurigio and J. Petersilia. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- MacKenzie, D., and Shaw, J. (1993). The impact of shock incarceration on technical violations and new criminal activities. *Justice Quar-*

- terly, 10 (3), 463-486.
- MacKenzie, D., Brame, R., McDowall, D., and Souryal, C. (1995). Boot camp prisons and recidivism in eight states. *Criminology*, 33 (3), 327-357.
- MacKenzie, D., and Rosay, A. (1996). Correctional boot camps for juveniles. In *Juvenile and adult boot camps*, pp. 93-119. Maryland: American Correctional Association: Edited Volume.
- Maltz, M. (1984). *Recidivism: Quantitative studies in social relations*. New York: Academic Press.
- Maxfield, M., and Babbie, E. (1998). *Research methods for criminal justice and criminology, 2nd edition*. California: Wadsworth.
- (MCDSC) Montgomery County Department of Community Supervision and Corrections. Juvenile Services: STAR Handbook, (1994-1995).
- Morash, M., and Rucker, L. (1990). A critical look at the idea of the boot camp as a correctional reform. *Crime and Delinquency*, 36 (2), 204-222.
- Osler, M. (1991). Shock incarceration: Hard realities and real possibilities. *Federal Probation*, 55 (1), 34-42.
- Parent, D. (1989). *Shock incarceration: An overview of existing programs*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Peters, M., Thomas, D., and Zamberlan, C. (1997). *Boot camps for juvenile offenders*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Platt, A. (1977). *The child savers: The invention of delinquency, 2nd edition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Poole, C., and Slavick, P. (1995). *Boot camps: A Washington State update and overview of national findings*. Washington State Institute for Public Policy. Olympia: Washington.
- Rothman, D. (1980). *Conscience and convenience: The asylum and its alternatives in progressive America*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Rothman, D. (1990). *The discovery of the asylum: Social order and disorder in the new republic*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Salerno, A. (1994). Boot camps: A critique and a proposed alternative. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 20 (3/4), 147-158.
- Sechrest, D. (1989). Prison "boot camps" do not measure up. *Federal Probation*, 53 (3), 15-20.
- Sherman, L., Gottfredson, D., MacKenzie, D., Eck, J., Rueter, P., and Bushway, S. (1998). *Preventing crime: What works, what doesn't, what's promising*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Toby, J., and Pearson, F.S. (1992). *Boot camps for juvenile offenders: Constructive intervention and early support-implementation evaluation*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

- Tonry, M. (1998). Evaluating intermediate sanctions programs. In *Community corrections: Probation, parole, and intermediate sanctions*, pp. 79-96. Edited by J. Petersilia. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Travis, L., Schwartz, M., and Clear, T. (1992). *Corrections: An issues approach, 3rd edition*. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Company.
- Trulson, C. (1998). *School-Based juvenile boot camps: An introduction and evaluation of Specialized Treatment and Rehabilitation (STAR)*. Unpublished master's thesis, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas.
- Waldron, T. (1991). Boot camp prison offers second chance to young felons. *Corrections Today*, 146-169.
- Wiebush, R. (1993). Juvenile intensive supervision: The impact on felony offenders diverted from institutional placement. *Crime and Delinquency*, 39 (1), 68-89.
- Zhang, S. (1998). In search of hopeful glimpses: A critique of research strategies in current boot camp evaluations. *Crime and Delinquency*, 44 (2), 314-344.

Appendix A. Offense Seriousness Scale for Bi-Variate Comparisons

Felony X (weight = 7)

Capital murder.

Felony 1-2-3 (weight = 6)

Aggravated assault; kidnapping; arson; burglary with intent to commit felony; burglary of habitation; criminal mischief > \$1500; ceady conduct (firearm); evading arrest; indecency with a child; manslaughter; possession of a controlled substance; riot participation; robbery; sexual assault.

Felony S (weight = 5)

Endangerment of a child; burglary of building; criminal mischief (church/cemetery/PB building); criminal mischief < \$1500; criminal negligent homicide; delivering drug paraphernalia; delivering marijuana > 50 lbs.; theft > \$1500; engaging in organized criminal activity; tampering with witness; unauthorized use of a vehicle; credit card abuse.

Misdemeanor offenses against person (weight = 4)

Assault causing bodily injury; stalking; harassment; resisting arrest; enticing a child; misdemeanor sex offenses.

Other Misdemeanor (weight = 3)

Theft < \$50; criminal trespass; possession of marijuana < 2 oz.; public ewdness; possession of alcohol (minor); discharge explosive; cruelty to animals; disorderly conduct.

Probation Violation (weight = 1)

Violation of court order; abscond; failure to comply with stipulations.

Status Offenses (weight = 1)

Truancy; runaway.

NOTE: Adapted to Texas' Penal Code Offense Descriptions. Table type and method adapted from Wiebush 1993.

Chad R. Trulson is a doctoral candidate in the College of Criminal Justice at Sam Houston State University in Huntsville Texas. His research interests include juvenile and adult corrections, specifically confinement and community-based sanctions. He has acquired a wide range of experience working with juvenile offenders in confinement and treatment capacities and is currently working as a Juvenile Parole Officer contracted through the Texas Youth Commission (TYC).

Ruth Triplett is an associate professor in the College of Criminal Justice at Sam Houston State University in Huntsville Texas. Her research interests include the role of poverty in antisocial behavior and juvenile delinquency. She has had recent publications in the *Journal of Criminal Justice and Justice Quarterly*.