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Correctional boot camps have become wildly popular as an alternative sanction to imprisonment. By using a military approach to corrections, this type of program utilizes punishment combined with treatment and is considered an "intermediate sanction." However, since intermediate sanctions are a relatively new concept, available literature reveals little as to why or how the armed forces basic training model is utilized for correctional programs. Nor could a theoretical explanation be found as to why the military's basic training model has been employed. Through the use of questionnaire responses, in-person interviews of employees at a correctional boot camp, and on-site observation, this study attempts to describe and characterize a correctional boot camp in Montana, Treasure State Correctional Training Center (TSCTC), and compares this program to the armed forces basic training model. Based upon these sources of data, this thesis describes and examines the Treasure State Correctional Treatment Center. Results show that the armed forces model lends itself to the design of a correctional facility in structure and discipline for convicted offenders.
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The field of corrections has become inundated with offenders. At the end of 2002, the total correctional population was estimated at over 6.7 million (Harrison and Beck 2003). At midyear 2003, the prison population of federal, state and local facilities was over 2 million (Harrison and Karberg 2004). With increasing numbers, alternatives to prison appear daily. One alternative that has gained considerable popularity is the concept of boot camps.

As the name suggests, "boot camps" are designed as an alternative sanction for individuals who would otherwise be incarcerated within federal or state prisons or local jails. Styled as a military training and leadership program, offenders experience "doing time" in a much different way than sitting in a cell. Generally designed to alleviate prison overcrowding, the idea of correctional boot camps provides a setting where offenders have the opportunity to go through intensive rehabilitation, learning tools needed to function legally within society. Offenders participate in "military drill and ceremony, physical training and hard labor" (MacKenzie and Souryal 1994:1). Under close supervision, offenders live much like brand new soldiers, learning military structure and discipline.

This thesis will explore and describe the philosophical evolution of correctional thought leading to contemporary use of correctional boot camps. This historical portrayal provides an understanding of how correctional boot camps came into existence, the theoretical basis for this type of program, and a characterization of a particular correctional boot camp in Montana. Finally, as intermediate sanctions are a relatively new idea, this thesis will enrich the literature by adding a detailed explanation of a specific intermediate sanction.
CORRECTIONS IN RETROSPECT

PHILOSOPHY OF CORRECTIONS

The philosophy of corrections and punishment is what drives policy choices or changes at any point in history. These policy choices or approaches to sanctioning can be better described as what kind of punishment and/or corrections society is using based on the values, norms and politics of the day (Mays and Winfree 1998). The following seven approaches to sanctioning highlight choices and changes in correctional thought.

Retribution. The idea of revenge or retaliation for a harm or wrong that was done to another individual or society as a whole. This concept is many times called “just deserts” and focuses on the idea that offenders deserve punishment for the harm they have done. It is anticipated that the punishment will be uncomfortable for the wrongdoer and will provide a sense of relief or justice served for the wronged party. It focuses on the notion of “‘righting the wrong,’ and reinforces the legitimacy of laws” (Westermann and Burfeind 1991:112).

Deterrence. Punishing or correcting an individual can prevent future criminal behavior. This concept is broken down into both “specific” deterrence, targeting the specific offender and “general” deterrence, aimed at the general public. This concept assumes that individuals who are punished serve as “object lessons” for other. Thus, future criminal behavior is discouraged through the fear individuals have of punishment they may receive for crimes committed (Mays and Winfree 1998).
Incapacitation. Prevents a person from future criminal behavior by making the offender “incapable of committing further law violations” (Westermann and Burfeind 1991:113). Incapacitation can come in many forms, including; incarceration, medical treatment (such as castration, removal of hands), physical restraints, banishment or even death (Westermann and Burfeind 1991).

Rehabilitation. The belief that offenders can change if assistance is provided. This assistance can be psychological, educational or training in nature. Proponents of rehabilitation believe that this approach will help offenders to be less likely to engage in criminal behavior in the future (Westermann and Burfeind 1991). This approach embraces the belief that criminal behavior can be “identified, isolated, treated and cured” resulting in an association with the medical model approach to corrections (Bartollas 1985:26, Westermann and Burfeind 1991).

Restitution. The repayment by the offender to the victim or the community for wrongs done. Repaying the victim or community can come in the form of fines (monetary) or community service (labor), placing restitution in the community corrections model of punishment. According to Mays and Winfree (1998), restitution was originally designed as an alternative to incarceration, but since offenders paying restitution would also most likely have received probation or a fine, the restitution becomes an “add-on.” Restitution is an additional sentence that requires the offender to work to pay off their crime, holding them accountable for their actions. Thus, restitution could be grouped in with the balanced and restorative model of sentencing.

Reintegration. This method of corrections advocates helping offenders transition from the institutional life, back into a community. Since most offenders will return to a
community, the community should help a person get back on their feet so that he or she is less likely to re-offend. Reintegration takes into account that most offenders who do not succeed on "the outside" do so shortly after they get out of prison. Therefore, the community should have a vested interest in helping individuals succeed in their community. Also, this model emphasizes that the transition from prison to a community can be very difficult and that it is the communities responsibility to help in the transitional process (Mays and Winfree 1998).

*Balanced and restorative justice.* Emphasizes accountability, public safety and competency development. The balanced and restorative justice model (see figure 1) provides a strong base in preparing an individual in becoming a responsible citizen. Working off the understanding that most offenders will eventually be released from incarceration, the emphasis is on having the offender work to gain their rights back while helping them gain skills needed to reenter society. There is also a strong emphasis on protecting the community the offender will rejoin.

![Diagram of Balanced and Restorative Justice Model](image)

*Figure 1: Balanced and Restorative Justice Model*
EVOLUTION OF PUNISHMENT

Throughout history, society has gone back and forth between punishment ideas or correctional philosophies. Like swinging on a “correctional pendulum” with one extreme being punishment and the other extreme being rehabilitation. However, the difference has always been rooted in how the correction has been administered.

Early justice: Retribution. Dating back 35,000 years primitive justice embraces the idea of private revenge. This private revenge was justified as taking personal action against the offender or wrongdoer based on the belief that criminals deserved or earned the punishment they were to receive. Punishment was viewed as a private affair where the wronged party was responsible for exacting justice. These “wrongs were avenged in accordance with the lex talionis, or law of retaliation” (Clear and Cole 2003:26). This law of retaliation was based on the principle that the degree of punishment should correspond with the degree of the offense. Thus the idea of “an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth” was born. Punishments were harsh and arbitrary but accepted by the general populace. Moving from this type of arbitrary justice, were the first attempts at codifying law and punishments. Examples of these can be found in writings such as the Sumerian law of Mesopotamia (3100 B.C.), the Code of Hammurabi (1750 B.C.), Mosaic Law (13th Century B.C.), and Legal Codes of the Roman Empire (6th Century B.C.).

In England and throughout Europe, private revenge was popular due to the fact that most communities were small and had little or no strong central government, but acts of private revenge many times led to feuds that easily worked themselves into small wars. According to Clear and Cole (2003) the Middle Ages brought about a change in
punishment. Private revenge "gradually gave way to the view that the peace of society required the public to participate in determining guilt or innocence and in exacting a penalty" (Clear and Cole 2003:26). Due to the large and lengthy feuds caused by private revenge, justice became focused on "maintaining public order" while righting the wrong and punishing the wrongdoer. With a movement towards public justice, retribution and deterrence were combined. The intent was to make justice common to all and involve the people in an effort of control. By developing a "common law" the offender was held accountable for their misdeeds, many times, receiving harsh physical punishment, and also order was maintained among the people. By making punishments a "spectator sport," future criminal behavior was controlled and the sovereign or king's power was observed by his subjects.

Moving towards a rational system of justice. Following the period of "King's Peace" was another form of deterrence. By the mid 18th Century the idea of having a rationale for punishment and justice was introduced. Two objectives were subsequently brought to the forefront; 1.) develop a more rational and more just system, and 2.) make the punishment more humanitarian and proportionate (the punishment should fit the crime). This new "reasoning" led to many reforms in correctional thought. Looking to an Italian scholar, Cesare Beccaria and his ideas about deterring crime, the idea of imprisonment as a form of punishment was adopted. Up to this point, imprisonment was not considered a "primary" form of punishment. Jails and houses of correction were used for those awaiting court or housed individuals who were unable to pay their debts; yet the conditions of jails and houses of corrections were far from good, often filthy and overcrowded.
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Beccaria was concerned that there was little reasoning behind public response to crimes and the severity of punishment. Through this concern, Beccaria introduced the idea that the ultimate goal of punishment should be to deter crime, but could only do so if:

1.) The laws are clear and understandable to the everyday person.
2.) If punishment is seen by the general public.
3.) The punishment is prompt, certain and proportionate to the crime.

Using these ideals, a more “rationale” form of justice was developed. Beccaria’s ideas not only encouraged reform in the area of punishment, but also in the area of “legal rationality,” or a legal system that is based upon statutory law. Beccaria contended that law should be produced from a legislative process or voted on by representatives of the people, and should then be systematically written down or codified. Beccaria also argued that this “statutory law” should be fixed, clear and understandable to all.

Beccaria’s ideas led to the introduction of the formal penitentiary. Although prison reform spanned a considerable length of time, by the late 1700s the United States had developed the first recognized “penitentiary,” Philadelphia’s Walnut Street Jail. This penitentiary was considered a place of penance to reflect on misdeeds, repent, and be reformed (Clear and Cole 2003).

**Progressive thought and reform.** The invention of the penitentiary was a major stepping stone in modern corrections. Born of the “enlightenment” or the “age of reason,” reformers brought to light the ideas of reasoning behind punishment. Following this the United States entered a period of major social change. With an influx of immigrants and a majority of the population moving from the countryside to the cities,
new social problems came to the forefront. Attacking these social problems were groups of individuals known as "progressives."

According to Clear and Cole (2003), "by the mid-1800's, reformers had become disillusioned with the penitentiary" (48). Not only had penitentiaries become overcrowded, "discipline was lax, brutality was common, and administrators were viewed as corrupt" (Clear and Cole 2003:48). Many progressives or "reformers" found these conditions inadequate. They argued that the main goal of the penitentiary should be reformation and the preparation for release of the inmate. From this came the reformatory, which used three new ideas: inmate classification, indeterminate sentences and parole, and individualized treatment.

By classifying inmates based on treatment needs, administrators were able to determine what programs an inmate required to be prepared to be released back into society. Classification also allowed for inmates to be classified according to their performance while in the institution. This led to the use of indeterminate sentences, in which prisoners were required to "prove" that they had been reformed. To do so, inmates participated in education and religious programs and showed good behavior. The process would take a longer period of time than the original use of fixed sentences but the idea was that "reform takes time." Parole was an extension of the indeterminate sentence, created to be a motivator for change. Administrators felt that if an individual could have a goal in mind, parole, their behavior would change more quickly. Also, parole gave the corrections system the ability to extend supervision, in which the inmate was able to reenter society, but still had the opportunity to work on their behavior (Clear and Cole 2003).
Working in large cities, with immigrant populations, progressives “believed that criminals could be rehabilitated through individualized treatment” (Clear and Cole 2003:50). Seeking to “understand and cure crime through a case-by-case approach” progressives believed that individuals needed programs that fit their needs, not a cookie-cutter or ordered routine. This specification of treatment required a diagnosis of each individual and emphasized discretion on the part of administrators. Using an approach known as the medical model, administrators were able to use discretion when deciding the needs of individuals. This individualized treatment allowed for the “promotion of parole and probation,” as well as the expansion of prisons (Clear and Cole 2003:51).

Community corrections and reintegration. In the early 1970s, rehabilitation as a form of corrections became less popular. Americans began to question if the medical model worked and how involved the public should be in the correction of offenders (Lipton, Martinson and Wilks 1975). According to the 1967 President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice,

Crime and delinquency are symptoms of failures and disorganization of the community... The task of corrections, therefore, includes building or rebuilding social ties, obtaining employment and education, securing in the larger senses a place for the offender in the routine functioning of society (1967:7).

This call to the public gained rapid momentum and there was a strong press for alternatives to incarceration. The community corrections model called for radical changes to “the medical model’s emphasis on treatment in prison” (Clear and Cole 2003:56). Emphasis shifted from treating the offender and the use of institutions to reintegration and community programs that “would increase offenders’ opportunities to become successful citizens” (Clear and Cole 2003:56). Proponents of the community
corrections model suggested the use of alternatives such as probation, halfway houses and community service, all of which are still used today.

**Getting tough on crime.** The idea of reintegration and programs associated with this model are still being practiced in modern corrections, but public concern about rising crime rates and ineffectiveness of community programs brought about a new shift in correctional thought. In the 1980s and through the late 1990s, the idea of “just deserts” or retributive justice once again became popular. The public became tired of treating offenders with a soft hand and the crime committed. Overall the view was that punishment should be just that, punishment. This model also created a shift in sentencing to determinate sentences for certain crimes. The focus of determinate sentences is deterrence, which can come in two forms, general and specific. General deterrence is intended to make an example which the general public will see. The presumed end result is that the general public will not commit that offense. Specific deterrence is meant to discourage the offender from committing future offenses (Clear and Cole 2003). One form of specific deterrence would be state habitual offender laws or what is popularly known as “3 strike and your out.” Habitual offender laws are a prime example of the publics response to the call to “get tough on crime.”

**Modern corrections: Intermediate sanctions and balanced and restorative justice.** Although crime control model proponents argue that the get tough model is directly responsible for the fall in the crime rate, America’s prisons are largely overcrowded and there is an overload in parole and probation nationwide. Further, “the financial and human costs of the retributive crime control policies of the 1990’s are now being scrutinized” (Clear and Cole 2003:57). With so many people in prisons and the
costs to the public rising, the question has been raised if there is a better way to deal with offenders.

In their 1990 book *Between Prisons and Probation*, Morris and Tonry made a major criticism of current criminal sentencing saying that there are only two extremes: 1.) prison, which in their view is too harsh and 2.) probation, which is too lenient. Taking a logical look at sentencing, these two realized that most offenders in prison would eventually rejoin society and offenders on probation had little or no supervision. They called for a larger range of punishments that would be less extreme than prison but more intensive than probation. Morris and Tonry identified four programs that they felt would fill this void: 1.) electronic monitoring, 2.) home confinement, 3.) intensive probation supervision, and 4.) boot camps.

These programs, aptly termed “intermediate sanctions,” as well as others, have been developed and implemented throughout the United States and are currently available as components of sentences to many judges. These programs have gained popularity due to their “balanced” nature of punishment and rehabilitation. The resulting model is commonly referred to as balanced and restorative justice. As discussed earlier, balanced and restorative justice takes a three pronged approach. Many of today’s programs emphasize having the offender work to gain their rights back and lead responsible lives (accountability) while they learn skills needed to succeed in society (competency development). Also, while the offender is preparing to reenter society, the community can feel some sort of protection due to the intensive supervision the offender must comply with (public safety).
In the next section, one intermediate sanction, the correctional boot camp, will be explored in depth. Although there are a plethora of intermediate sanctions in use today, little has been written about the creation, structure and philosophy of the correctional boot camp and why this model is thought to be effective.

DEVELOPMENT OF CORRECTIONAL BOOTCAMPS

The correctional boot camp is a contemporary program that reflects the goals of the balanced and restorative justice model. Many people can remember the days when judges gave offenders the option between prison and the military. This was thought to be an effective sentencing tool due to the structured nature, discipline utilized, and constant supervision employed within the military. Today the United States Military is not an option open for sentencing, but the military model has been used in the development of an alternative sanction.

Why use the military model? Correctional boot camps, also known as shock incarceration, have been in existence since 1983 (MacKenzie and Herbert 1995). The first correctional boot camp, a 50 bed program implemented in Georgia was “fueled primarily by the growth in number of offenders incarcerated during the past decade and changing views of the role of punishment and treatment in the correctional system” (MacKenzie and Herbert 1995 pg.). Following this, boot camps began to pop up across the United States. In 1990, only twenty-six prisons had inmates participating in boot camp programs (Stephan 1997). In five years this number jumped to sixty-five boot camp programs. In another five years this number increased to ninety-five programs nation wide (Stephan and Karberg 2003). Alexis Durham (1994) discusses a number of
factors that may contribute to this increase. He states that prison boot camps began attracting considerable attention due to the “search for solutions to the crime and prison crowding problems that led to the adoption of a range of novel sanctions” (Durham 1994:231). He goes on to point out that boot camps are a result of,

“the common sense appeal of the concept. Good hard physical work, rigorous discipline, and personal accountability are commonly regarded as important values in American culture...thus it should not be surprising that a sanction that provides structure and activities expressive of those values naturally possesses popular appeal” (Durham 1994:).

Durham (1994) goes on to highlight six points that make boot camps attractive as an alternative sanction.

1.) **Punitive orientation:** Where inmates live under difficult demands both in terms of living quarters and physical tasks. Durham (1994:pg) points out that this is satisfying to larger society as it is the “antithesis of the ‘country club’ prisons the public often believes are characteristic of the correctional system.”

2.) **Deterrence:** As discussed earlier, the belief that by making incarceration painful and difficult, individuals will choose to lead a life without crime.

3.) **Generally designed for first time offenders:** Durham (1994)suggests that by reaching out to young “budding criminals” and teaching them how to behave responsibly, they will get them out of the system before they learn the life of crime.

4.) **Self-control:** Using a highly structured and disciplined environment, inmates develop self-control.

5.) **Short sentence/cost control:** Working off of the premise that boot camp programs are shock therapy and last only a short period of time (and hopefully deters individuals from re-offending), the cost will be smaller than incarceration in long term institutions.

6.) **Short sentence/overcrowding:** Prisons and other long term institutions will be less overcrowded because more individuals can be dealt with in a short period of time.

The fact that most boot camps are voluntary and in some states offer the opportunity to shorten an inmates sentence if they successfully complete the program, can also appeal to inmates. Overall, Durham argues that “work, discipline, and physical
exertion have been imposed on offenders in one form or another since the earliest
systems of punishment were designed and put into operation” (1994:238).

In the twenty years since their creation, much debate has arisen about the purpose
and effectiveness of these programs. Nationwide, boot camp programs vary
considerably, depending on things such as location, organizational control (be it local,
state, or private), and program goals. Although there is much speculation on the
effectiveness of these programs, there is very little discussion about where the concept of
“boot camp rehabilitation” comes from. Obviously, most programs operate using a
military setting, thus the title “boot camp.” However, literature and current research give
little description as to why “punishment” and/or “rehabilitation” work when using a
military operational method.

MacKenzie and Herbert (1995) explain that correctional boot camps adopt a very
military-like routine, creating an atmosphere that resembles military basic training, and
utilizing components of military structure and discipline. But what do the terms military
“structure” and “discipline” mean? Cronin (1994:23) argues that “while military
structure and discipline are the defining features of a boot camp, the specific activities
and procedures that make up military structure and discipline can vary considerably.”

MILITARY STRUCTURE AND DISCIPLINE

Roberta C. Cronin (1994:25) outlines eleven basic military components (activities
and procedures) that have been adopted by many boot camp programs:

1) barracks-style housing
2) military titles
3) military-style protocol
4) drill instructors
5) military-style uniforms for staff
6) military-style uniforms for offenders
7) grouping in platoons (members enter together)
8) summary punishment
9) group rewards and punishments
10) “brig” or punishment cell, and
11) public graduation ceremony (Cronin 1994:25).

These characteristics are commonly cited in the literature and serve as a foundation of the daily routine that offenders adopt while participating in correctional boot camps. In “Boot Camps for Adult and Juvenile Offenders: Overview and Update,” Cronin (1994:6) notes that “in a culture where many people view military services as a formative experience, the public also seems to intuitively grasp the rehabilitative rationale for the programs.” Cronin further states that many correctional boot camps utilize elements common to the military in their overall program composition. Although structure and discipline are somewhat abstract ideas, by using Cronin’s military components one can see those ideas at work and realize their use in a rehabilitative setting. The structure and discipline employed in the military seems to carry over into not only the daily routine, but into treatment as well. Cronin further points out that proponents of correctional boot camps argue that military and correctional boot camps are similar in that there is a foundation of discipline and responsibility.

**Major goals of correctional boot camps.** In addition to Cronin’s defining features of structure and discipline, a number of ancillary key goals are central to the military operational model. Looking from state to state, program goals and components vary but discipline, structure, hard work, and skill development seem to be prominent throughout. In “Boot Camps for Adult and Juvenile Offenders: Overview and Update”, Cronin measured the consistency of program goals. These goals were featured in at least
twenty-six of the twenty-nine measured programs. The first major goal, discipline, in which individuals display increased maturity and self-control in their behaviors and actions. Second, boot camp participants are held to a rigorous daily schedule designed by program officials. Again, the structure can vary from state to state, but most programs displayed the need to hold participants to a consistent schedule. Following structure, hard work proved to be a major goal of many state programs. Depending on the institution, hard work can be broken down into two parts, both physical and mental. According to Doris MacKenzie and Eugene Herbert “one major difference among the many forms of boot camp programs is the amount of time in the daily schedule devoted to therapeutic and educational activities in comparison to drill, ceremony, and physical training and work” (1996:viii). Lastly, participants in most programs are required to take classes and/or treatment designed to develop skill they will need in larger society. Skill development comes in a variety of forms, from gaining a GED to parenting skills to anger management.

**Balancing the goals.** Looking to a study of experimental boot camps for juvenile offenders, major characteristics and design of three programs are outlined. Cleveland, OH, Denver, CO, and Mobile, AL implemented experimental boot camps that “placed different emphasis on military elements as opposed to treatment activities” (Peters, Thomas, and Zamberlan 1997:14). Of the three, Denver was notable for it strong emphasis on military aspects of correction. Working from the other side of the coin, Cleveland put greatest emphasis on treatment, where youth were “increasingly engaged in learning and skill-building activities” (Peters, Thomas, and Zamberlan 1997:14). While the first two programs had a strong emphasis in either military discipline or
treatment, Mobile married the two to create a program where “military training and
treatment activities coexisted in relative balance” (Peters, Thomas, and Zamberlan
1997:14).

SOCIAL IDENTITY THEORY

Social identity theory serves as a useful theoretical model in explaining why boot
camps are effective modes of changing criminal behavior. This theory suggests that
individuals learn norms and values based on their social-identity, which is derived from
group membership. “Who we are among others” is central to this theory. According to
John C. Turner (1999:8), one of the originators of social identity theory, social identity is
“a person’s definition of self in terms of some social group membership with the
associated value connotations and emotional significance.” Values and norms a person
learns based on “assigned social category membership” are important in a persons’
development of self-identity within a group.

Turner further explains that social identity is a process in which individuals place
more importance on the group than on their individuality. The individual becomes
secondary to the group. Individuals lose their sense of individuality, in return for a sense
of self that fits with the social group to which they belong. Turner (1999:11) calls this a
“cognitive redefinition of the self.” Individuals leave the “self” they know behind and
take on the attitudes and behaviors espoused and accepted by the group to which they
have become a member, transforming “individual differences to shared social category
memberships and associated stereotypes” (Turner 1999:11).
Turner (1999:12) also states that “social identity refers to social categorizations of self and others, self-categories which define the individual in terms of his or her shared similarities with members of certain social categories in contrast to other social categories.” This suggests that individuals identify with a group, accepting its behaviors, values, and norms, while recognizing that this group is separate and different from others. For example, when a person joins the military, they are no longer civilians, they are now members of the armed forces. Turner (1999:12) suggests that by identifying with social categories, “we perceive ourselves as ‘we’ and ‘us’ as opposed to ‘I’ and ‘me.’” In the case of the individual who joins the military, they have become a member of the armed forces, a very large “us.” Although the individual may retain the “I” in that they become a soldier, the “us” ultimately defines them as a member of the armed forces.

**Social identity and criminal behavior.** Social identity theory looks at the development of criminal behavior through the influence of the social group an individual is attached. Franke (2000:176) states “the stronger individuals’ commitment to a particular group, the more potent the group identity becomes and the more they will perceive the group norms and values as part of their self-conceptions.” Thus when an individual is part of a group that holds norms and values consistent with criminal behavior, the individual will take these norms and values for their own. The individual then becomes a member of a “criminal group.” These groups can include a neighborhood, in-school peers, out of school peers, and even family. Further, the more commitment (or importance) and individual places on these social groups, the less they will feel committed to values outside those espoused by their social group. Using social identity theory as a basis to explain criminal behavior, one can surmise that individuals
who attach themselves to criminal groups will take on attributes and behaviors that do not align with larger society.

**Social identity and the military model.** Using social identity theory, Franke explores “military socialization,” and how attitudes, values, and behaviors are shaped through this process. He states, “basic training, for instance, typically disconnects recruits from past social networks and established identities and develops new identities” (Franke 2000:176). Looking at overall basic training, when an individual joins this new social group, their attitudes, values and behaviors change. An individual’s personal identity shifts to fit the group identity. Thus, any self-identification is a result of social relationships and interaction within the group.

When using the military model to develop a correctional program, social identity theory can be utilized. By taking individuals who have aligned themselves with “criminal groups,” it becomes necessary to change attitudes, values and behaviors. Placing individuals in a new social group provides the opportunity to learn new attitudes and values and develop new identities.

**Limitations of social identity theory and the military model.** Although social identity theory is a useful perspective in explaining criminal behavior, there are some gaps that have yet to be explained. Foremost is how the group influences identity. Social identity theory tells us that the “we” is greater than the “I” but it does not explain the social process of group influence. For example, differential association theory discusses how social groups influence attitudes and behaviors due to frequency, priority, duration and intensity of group contact (Sutherland, Cressey and Luckenbill 1992:89). Akers social learning theory discusses the group process and the emphasis of modeling,
imitation, and reinforcement in learned behaviors (Akers and Sellers 2004:85-89). This insight into how groups influence attitudes and behaviors can fill the gaps left by social identity theory. While recognizing the deficiencies of this theory is clearly important, this work will focus on the perspective social identity theory offers and provide an in depth look into this new social group, the correctional boot camp.

PREVIOUS ASSESSMENT OF CORRECTIONAL BOOT CAMPS

Since their origination in 1983, little has been written as to how the armed forces basic training model has been employed in correctional boot camps. Previous work in this area of research describes what correctional boot camps are and has attempted to evaluate topics such as attitudes of inmates and recidivism, but there has been little discussed about correctional boot camps comparison to the armed forces basic training model. The limited comparative work that has been done can be attributed to Doris Layton MacKenzie, a frontrunner in research on correctional boot camps. MacKenzie, together with Eugene Herbert, discuss correctional boot camps and their use of armed forces basic training components and training. In their book, *Correctional Boot Camps: A Tough Intermediate Sanction*, they look directly at what makes a boot camp a "correctional boot camp" and how these programs are consistent with the armed forces basic training model (MacKenzie and Herbert 1995). MacKenzie and Herbert (1995:viii) assert that programs are correctional boot camps if they:

1.) have military drill and ceremony as a component of the program
2.) separate the participants from the general prison population offenders
3.) are considered to be an alternative to confinement; and
4.) require offenders to participate in a rigorous daily schedule of hard labor and physical training.
MacKenzie and Herbert (1996:viii) state that “to some degree most boot camps incorporate these components.” They further identify essential military basic training goals that correctional boot camps commonly utilize as part of the program. These military basic training goals are taken from the Armed Forces Manual (Army 1991), which outlines “key issues that are essential to military boot camp training goals” (MacKenzie and Herbert 1996:19). Some of the key training goals of military boot camps that have relevance to correctional boot camps are program organization, dignity of the participant, drill instructor control, and participant responsibility.

According to MacKenzie and Herbert (1996:19), the primary purpose of armed forces boot camps are to “convert a civilian into a soldier who is physically conditioned, motivated, and self-disciplined.” They state that the armed forces environment is “highly conducive to assisting in the correction of first-time, nonviolent offenders, and preparing for their reintroduction into the community.”

Prior to her work with Eugene Herbert, MacKenzie worked with Claire Souryal on an extensive evaluation of eight state boot camp programs. This evaluation was included in her book with Eugene Herbert, but was first completed for the National Institute of Justice. Their report, entitled “Multisite Evaluation of Shock Incarceration,” was the first evaluation of correctional boot camps that was not limited to one location. As mentioned earlier, the terms shock incarceration and correctional boot camp are used synonymously in this work. In completing a study of multiple sites, MacKenzie and Souryal made it possible for generalizations to be made about correctional boot camps.

MacKenzie and Souryal’s multisite evaluation was conducted using eight state level correctional programs, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Louisiana, New York, Oklahoma, and
South Carolina, and Texas. Using these eight programs, MacKenzie and Souryal assessed five components of correctional boot camps to describe the efficacy of boot camp programs.

First, a qualitative description of each program was completed to answer questions about program goals, target population, selection, daily routine, percentage of completion, and aftercare supervision intensity. Each of the eight program descriptions were based on interviews from staff and inmates, official program materials, and on site observation.

Second, MacKenzie and Souryal measured attitude change of inmates during incarceration. This measure was done in two ways. First, in seven of the eight states, a sample of prison inmates was compared to a sample of participants in the boot camp program. In Texas, a sample of boot camp participants who were part of an enhanced treatment group was compared to a group of participants who had not yet received the treatment. Institutional records and inmate self-report questionnaires were used to examine inmate attitudes. The self-report questionnaire was given to both sets of sample groups two times, one at the beginning of incarceration, both prison and boot camp incarceration, and one approximately ninety days later. The results MacKenzie and Souryal report are both interesting and enlightening. They report that in the states where boot camp participants were compared to prison inmates, the boot camp participants were more positive about their experience over time while prison inmates developed more negative attitudes or did not change. The results from the Texas program showed that there was not a difference between the types of programs and that both samples showed more positive attitudes about the experience.
The third component MacKenzie and Souryal measured was the boot camps impact on recidivism. They were interested in answering the question of boot camp success, or as they say “Do they reduce the criminal activity of offenders subsequent to release?” (MacKenzie and Souryal 1994:20). This area of assessment is very difficult to measure as there is currently no accepted definition of recidivism. Recidivism can be measured many ways and the validity and reliability of its measures has been questioned repeatedly. MacKenzie and Souryal note that there are an array issues that must be taken into consideration, including: time offenders have been out in the community, the type of measure of recidivism or what each state considers the definition of recidivism to be, sample selection (including comparison and random), and offender tracking. In their multisite evaluation, MacKenzie and Souryal take these issues into account and use a variety of measures when assessing at recidivism. Overall, MacKenzie and Souryal (1994:30) concluded that there was “little evidence that the shock incarceration experience leads to a reduction in offender recidivism.” However, they do suggest that participants who complete boot camp programs “appear to perform just as well as those who serve longer prison terms (MacKenzie and Souryal 1994:30).”

Looking beyond offender recidivism, MacKenzie and Souryal also measured how boot camp participants compared to prison parolees, probationers, and boot camp dropouts in the area of positive adjustment while on community supervision. Using a 10-item index that measured employment or enrollment in school, program participation, financial stability, supervision requirements, stability of residency and employment, negative incident avoidance, and problem solving skills, parole and probation agents rated offenders every three months during a 12 month follow up period. Three states also
reported number of contacts while on community supervision to measure supervision intensity. Though they did note that intensity of supervision may play a significant part in offender’s positive adjustment in the community, MacKenzie and Souryal (1994:33) report that “shock incarceration graduates did not adjust more positively to community supervision as is commonly hypothesized.”

The last component assessed in the multisite evaluation was bed space savings. Shortened sentence length is directly related to cost and crowding, and thus has always been a concern for many prisons. It has been a common hypothesis that correctional boot camps can alleviate prison overcrowding. MacKenzie and Souryal (1994:37) measured this component using a model that “estimated the total person-months of confinement saved by determining the difference between the average prison term and the average shock incarceration duration.” The analyses suggested that although correctional boot camps offer the opportunity for savings, prisons must take into account that “programs must be designed to ensure that participants would have otherwise served time in prison.” Keeping this in mind, MacKenzie and Souryal note that there are many factors that may indicate that correctional boot camps have little effect on bed space savings.

Roberta Cronin’s work follows in the footsteps of Doris MacKenzie and summarizes many of her findings. In trying to answer the question “do boot camps work?” Cronin forwards the following (arguments). First, Cronin (1994:57) notes that although boot camps do have “the potential to reduce institutional crowding and costs,” size, target population and recidivism must be taken into account. Cronin also agrees that there is little difference in offender recidivism between boot camp graduates and prison inmates. Finally, Cronin (1994:57) argues that boot camp participants find “boot camp a
positive experience" and "some programs seem to have helped participants improve physical conditioning, educational level, employment prospects, and access to community programs." Overall, Cronin supports MacKenzie and others work in research in boot camp assessments.

Lastly, it should be noted that although there are those who believe that the military provides a good foundation for correctional boot camps, there are those who disagree. MacKenzie and Parent (1992) point out that critics argue that the two are fundamentally different. This argument suggests that armed forces basic training is just the first step in a much longer process in which the final goal is to train men (in units) to fight and kill. As noted earlier, proponents disagree with this claim, noting that correctional boot camps utilize the fundamentals of self-discipline and responsibility employed by the military.

A DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF ONE CORRECTIONAL BOOT CAMP

Treasure State Correctional Training Center (TSCTC), located in Deer Lodge, Montana, provides an alternative to incarceration for state and state regional prisons. Holding up to 65 participants at one time, TSCTC is designed for individuals who have either been to prison or are sentenced to complete a boot camp program rather than incarceration. The voluntary program is open to all sentenced individuals who can pass the physical fitness requirement. The facility is located on prison property, separate from but in view of the main prison facility, and is designed as an open bay barracks in which
participants live, eat, and train with each other. There is little privacy as participants are with each other and in view of staff at all times.

Program participants vary in age, ranging from 18 to as old as 39. TSCTC at one point admitted female offenders, but at this time only accepts males. The program was originally designed for first time, non-violent offenders, but program administrators state that all types of individuals have been accepted with the exception of sex offenders as the camp does not have the necessary treatment classes for this special group. A variety of treatment and educational programs are offered at TSCTC, including: parenting classes, anger management, cognitive principles and restructuring, victimology, GED classes and testing, and chemical dependency treatment. The program is designed to be completed in 60 to 90 days, but participants can re-classify, start over, and stay up to an additional 90 days. Participants enter the program with 12 other individuals which form a squad. This squad or team works together, in treatment, education, and drill. Staffing for this facility includes 20 drill instructors, 4 line staff (treatment and administration), a doctor, an assistant director and a director.

RESEARCH METHODS

This evaluation looks to Treasure State Correctional Training Center to answer the following questions: (1) How is a correctional boot camp setting similar to armed forces basic training, and how does it differ? (2) Do correctional boot camp employees feel the program reflects structure and goals espoused by armed forces basic training? To begin answering these questions, this study consists of field observation, field interviews,
and a survey questionnaire of drill instructors. Official program materials were also used to describe and better understand Treasure State Correctional Training Center.

FIELD OBSERVATION

To gain a better understanding of the Treasure State Correctional Training Center, the researcher participated in onsite field observation. With approval from treatment staff and administration, the researcher spent three days at TSCTC orientation and intake process, observing three "new" squads enter the program. The researcher also visited the facility for one other full day and one half day to observe the faculty and daily routine. Notes were kept about program structure, program goals, daily routine, staff roles, and observable military influence. These notes were kept with the researcher at all times and were strictly anonymous. They do not identify any participants and were only used for the researcher to refer back to in giving basic description of the correctional boot camp setting.

FIELD INTERVIEWS

During the four and half days spent at TSCTC, the researcher had the opportunity to interview a number of drill instructors, treatment staff, and administrators. These interviews were guided by questions about the staff members opinions about correctional boot camps and armed forces basic training. The researcher used nondirective conversational exchange and open-ended questions with probing (Neuman, 1997). Treatment staff and administration were interviewed about program design and structure, treatment, as well as their opinions on the use of the armed forces basic training format at
TSCTC. Drill instructors were asked to discuss a number of topics including the structure of Treasure State Correctional Training Center, armed forces basic training, the type of treatment offered at TSCTC, and the commonalities and differences between TSCTC and armed forces basic training. Drill instructors at TSCTC are all required to complete a basic training program before they are employed. Many have been through formal basic training with the military. The researcher felt that these experiences made drill instructors opinions about the comparison between TSCTC and armed forces basic training valuable.

SURVEY OF DRILL INSTRUCTORS

Data was also collected through the use of a survey questionnaire administered to the TSCTC staff. Survey questionnaires along with a letter explaining the researcher's goals and a self-addressed stamped envelope were passed out to all TSCTC employees by the administrative assistant. The respondents were not asked any identifying questions such as name, gender or rank. These steps were taken in an effort to provide complete anonymity and to elicit the most complete and honest answers possible. Each respondent was then asked to mail the questionnaire back to the researcher when completed.

Subjects. Staff include 20 Drill instructors, two treatment staff, the director of treatment and an administrative assistant. All individuals who work for TSCTC were asked to complete the questionnaire because the sample size is small.

Instrument (see Appendix 1). This questionnaire includes both open and closed-ended questions. Questions 1 through 19 have been adapted from Mackenzie and Herbert's “Correctional Boot Camps: A Tough Intermediate Sanction,” published in
1995. These questions look to 1.) the four components MacKenzie and Herbert identify as those that classify a program as a correctional boot camp and 2.) essential military basic training goals, taken by MacKenzie and Herbert from the Armed Forces Manual and presented in the above paper. Question 20 is a list of common rehabilitation goals that respondents were asked to rank by importance. Questions 21 and 22 are open ended questions allowing respondents to state their opinions about Treasure State Correctional Training Center. Question 23 asks respondents to give Treasure State Correctional Training Center an overall rating. Respondents were also given the opportunity to add any comments they feel might be useful to the researcher.

REPORTING OF FINDINGS

As there are several forms of evaluation, findings will be reported in a number of ways. First, based on direct observation, I will report on a day in the life of a trainee and a staff member to characterize the daily experiences of inmates and then the staff. This description of orientation into the Treasure State Correctional Training Center boot camp program and a “typical” daily routine is offered from the perspective of the individuals observed. Second, an analysis of findings based upon field observation will be reported. Third, I will report on major themes found through field interviews conducted with staff at TSCTC. Finally, I will provide an analysis of opinions garnered from the survey questionnaire presented to TSCTC staff.
FINDINGS

OBSERVATIONS AT TSCTC

Day one: Orientation. Imagine you’re standing on a square on a hard tile floor that is one foot by one foot. You are wearing a white jumper that has been issued to you, that has only your last name written over the left breast. The staff at the boot camp have been cordial and polite and once you are told to stand in the square, you are introduced to the director who will briefly describe the program and advise you about staying healthy. The director tells you some basic need to know items like making sure you drink enough water and to let staff know if you are injured. The director has a pleasant voice and tells you that he wants to do an exercise. He tells you to close your eyes and think about a happy place. Your are told to make it somewhere you feel comfortable, like a field of green grass with a babbling brook flowing into a calm lake, where calm cool breezes make the trees shift in a gentle dance. You are relaxed and can see this place in your mind. The director tells you to hold onto this picture because (here his voice rises) “THIS IS REALITY.” At this point you are surrounded by what seems like 20 people yelling at you, telling you what to do and where to go. All at the same time.

One drill instructor is in your face yelling at you to get down and do push-ups then screams for you to get off the floor. One drill instructor is yelling at you to say “yes sir.” The first drill instructor yells again, this time asking what your crime is. Meekly you squeak out “theft.” She looks you dead in the eye and asks in a harsh voice, “who’d you rob, your grandma, a poor innocent old lady?” You didn’t know it before but now you do, these people know all about you, your crime, your victims, and you know they aren’t going to let you make it all “no big thing.” Suddenly you’re told to run over to a
chair and sit down. You run as fast as you can and sit down and the drill instructor standing by the chair yells at you to get up, and says “I didn’t tell you to sit down.” You stand up panting. The drill instructor asks who you are. You say your first name. The drill instructor immediately yells “No! Trainee. I asked for your name.” You tell them your last name. The drill instructor yells “Trainee (add last name) sir.” You feel a million different emotions and don’t know how to respond. Not knowing what will happen next, you repeat your name ending with “sir.” The drill instructor tells you to sit. You sit. The drill instructor yells out “yes sir!” “YES SIR!” you reply. And with that your head is shaved.

In no time your hair is gone. You didn’t realize it because the whole time the drill instructor was asking you about your crime. Every time you tell him something he tells you that you’re lying. You try to defend yourself, “it was just...” The drill instructor stops you in mid sentence with a loud “oh really?” He then continues with “that’s all huh. I bet you really think you’re something. You steal from a poor innocent old lady and say it was just...just what? Let me tell you something...you’re a criminal and I don’t care if you took a pack of gum. You’re here now and here you don’t get away with it was...JUST!” Quietly you say “yes sir.” The drill instructor roars “WHAT did you say?” Again you repeat “yes sir” a little louder.

You’re told to go back to your square and you run trying to get away from this person who has just described your crime and your character in plain black and white for everyone to hear. You realize everyone else is getting their heads shaved and with everyone in white jumpsuits, you all look the same. Suddenly another drill instructor is in your face. “Where do they all come from” you think to yourself. The drill instructor
hands you a piece of paper and tells you to read it. You look at it and she screams “hold it up, out in front of you.” You hold the sheet of paper up and start reading. The drill instructor yells “out loud.” You begin reading out loud and the drill instructor says “louder.” Louder now you read further. “Again,” the drill instructor yells, “and don’t stop until I tell you to.” Over and over you read the sheet handed to you (see Appendix 2). You have been reading for what seems like hours. You decide not to stop because reading from a sheet of paper is better than doing push-ups and being yelled at because you can’t really do push-ups correctly anyway, but your throat is getting dry and it’s harder and harder to talk and you realize you can get away with ABSOLUTELY NOTHING. You feel yourself perspiring and you know your face is red. You want to look at the other trainee’s around you but you keep hearing drill instructors yelling at other people telling them to keep their eyes forward or on their paper. You’re so glad you’re not being yelled at you keep reading. A drill instructor approaches you and tells you to hit the deck. You hesitate because the other drill instructor told you to keep reading, you don’t know what to do. The drill instructor screams for you to get on the floor. You drop, not knowing what else to do. You’re almost crying you’re so frustrated and you can barely hold yourself up because you had your arms up in the air so long holding up the sheet of paper. After what seems like a million push-ups the drill instructor tells you to get up and go inventory your foot locker. You’re tired, hot, sweaty, and thirsty even though the drill instructors keep telling you to drink water, and you have to take a piss. At this point you aren’t sure if you’re going to make it through this.

Finally after three hours it ends. The director tells you to line up. Two drill instructors lead you to the multi purpose room yelling “forward, march.” You and
everyone around you intones “yes sir” and begins marching to chow. Mercifully this day is over, you made it. You think to yourself “finally it’s over, I can be myself. Only 89 more days to go.” Belatedly you realize “myself is what got me here.”

_A day in the life: Daily Routine._ At 0455 hrs. I look out over the bay and notice that the trainees are beginning to stir. They know by now that their day is about to begin and although they all fell into their beds at 2200 hrs. and most went directly to sleep; their inner clocks have become accustomed to the schedule. It doesn’t take long. Not when we teach them structure by waking up every morning at the same time, 0500 hrs.

My fellow drill instructor yells for everyone to get up and stand to attention. Sixty-five men pile out of bed and wipe sleep out their eyes as they scramble to the ends of their bunks. Two rows of thirty plus men down the center of the bay. They all look the same except for one trainee who has decided to quit. He’s wearing orange. The rest of the trainees are in boxers and white tee shirts. The “quitter” as we call them, stands out and he knows it. We’re trying to convince him to stay, although it doesn’t seem that way to him. He’s so frustrated and he doesn’t know which way to turn. We won’t let him leave right away, because any individual only has two chances here. If he decides that he can tough it out and do what he needs to do to complete this program he can reclassify and start over. I think we might get this one to see that he has a choice, he just needs to make it.

After head count we call for the guys to hit the deck and start doing pushups. One of the trainees looks at the guys around him and I yell for everyone to start over. Invariably someone messes up and everyone pays for their mistake. Making them work for each other is a good thing, it makes them accountable and teaches them responsibility.
After the group finishes pushups, I call for them to line up to hit the head. In just minutes all of them are back making their beds and getting dressed for morning physical training. This is one of the best parts of the day. Although we supervise the trainees, they get to have some time where they are really working on themselves. We push them to try harder, but we're also running the two miles with them so we have to keep up and this gives them a little room. I yell at the last guy in from the run, "Trainee, what's your problem, you tired today?" "Yes sir" he responds. "Wake up, get moving, you still have a full day." Sometimes we have to get them motivated.

After p.t. the trainees change and get ready to raise the flag. It's only 0700 hours and the guys still need a little motivation. Time to raise the flag. This is a great exercise. Marching in formation, one of the trainees gets the privilege of being flag bearer. Standing at attention, all of the trainees witness the flag being raised. We don't do a lot of yelling here. This is a time for respect and understanding. I walk down the formation and move some of the guys hands so they know what proper formation looks like. The trainees salute the flag and march into chow.

After chow, the trainees brush their teeth and get ready for morning inspection. Just like in the military, these guys have strict guidelines they must follow. Their beds must be made a certain way; their footlockers have to be organized. One trainee has letters strewn all over his footlocker. "Down," I command. He hits the deck and begins counting his pushups. When he reaches twenty, I shout "up, fix that footlocker." Up he snaps, no arguing, he knows he messed up. Morning inspection continues with a few more pushups.
From here the guys will go to group or more p.t. depending on what squad they
are in. I'll see most of them in the group I facilitate as all of the trainees participate in all
of the treatment in this facility. Having drill instructors as facilitators is a positive thing.
Not only do I see them on the floor doing drill and a lot of other military based activities,
but I get to see them in the classroom too. Observing behavior in both settings helps me
and my coworkers know how these guys are acting in different situations. And all of the
drill instructors and treatment staff talk to each other. Communication is key when
working with these guys. If I see certain behaviors, both good and bad, I'm going to let
my coworkers know. This way we're all on the same page. I'll be heading home before
the day is finished, but I know that every day is about the same. These guys will have
their afternoon run, take down the flag, and have more treatment or p.t. then head to the
showers to get ready for bed. These trainees will put in a seventeen hour day today, yet it
goes by so fast, everything is always moving. Lights out will come way to quick and
tomorrow will come even quicker.

ANALYSIS OF OBSERVATION AT TSCTC

Three key elements were noted during my observation at TSCTC: orientation,
degradation process, and learning normative order. These elements will be used when
looking at how a correctional boot camp setting is similar to and different from an armed
forces basic training setting. As findings drawn from observations have already been
offered, this section attempts to analyze these findings.

*Orientation.* The orientation process at TSCTC is designed to be a basic
introduction into what life in the program will be like for trainees. Much like the
military, drill instructors assert their authority and show trainees that they are in control. To do this, drill instructors command individuals to do certain tasks, instruct trainees on how to address commanding officers, and illustrate the structure of the program.

Orientation at TSCTC is only one day long, versus the armed forces in which orientation lasts several days. Trainees in the armed forces spend several days reviewing the structure of basic training and military life. This major difference should be noted, as the training at TSCTC is designed to be much different than armed forces basic training. Armed forces basic training orientation gives trainees a sense of what is involved during a military career, which spans a number of years. Emphasis during orientation is placed on the 'basic' in the armed forces, as more extensive specified training follows for each trainee. Individuals who go through TSCTC are not being prepared to become soldiers as it is designed to be a correctional training program. The orientation process is intended to prepare trainees for TSCTC's program which provides life skills such as physical fitness, basic health, and various forms of correctional treatment.

TSCTC is structured much like the military in other ways. TSCTC begins orientation with a group of individuals. By the end of orientation, this group has become a "squad" that will stay together throughout the duration of the program. Similar to the military style, squads at TSCTC train together, eat together, and go to classes together. Unlike the military, which have rather large training groups, the squads at TSCTC consist of only thirteen men.

Degradation process. TSCTC and the armed forces both employ a process of degradation in which individuals are forced to cast off their old definitions of self. By utilizing a process of degradation, both the armed forces and TSCTC force individuals to
identify with a unit or group rather than with the "I." This is done in order to create a cohesive group of individuals who depend upon each other and identify with the group values and norms (Goffman 1984).

TSCTC and the armed forces make use of a number of devices intended to force the individual to tear down the old identity and create a new one that is consistent with the role they now play as part of a larger group. First and foremost, in both settings, individuals lose the use of their first names. By taking on the identity of "trainee" with the last name as the only individual identifier, participants lose the sense of self and their former life as an individual with a distinct personality. Second, TSCTC and the armed forces require trainees to cut off their hair and dress the same as everyone around them. Here, individuals lose even more of their separate identities and become a part of the larger group. This is important to recognize because throughout history, clothing and hair styles have been used as a way to demonstrate a sense of individuality. Taking away the ability to portray self through outward means literally strips a person of their former self and the identity that went with that self.

A major difference that should be noted is that the military requires trainees to dress in a uniform much like drill instructors that commands recognition and respect, whereas in TSCTC, the trainees are clothed like each other but not like drill instructors. Trainees at TSCTC are dressed in denim jeans, denim shirts and colored baseball caps which makes them distinct and denotes a lesser position.

**Learning normative order.** The final observation gained from the time I spent at TSCTC concerned normative order. Beginning at orientation, trainees must learn and memorize the information sheet mentioned earlier (see Box 1). This information sheet
has eight general rules, nine foundation errors, five deterrents, five big truths and eight
definitions that all program participants are required to memorize and comply with while
at TSCTC and to graduate. The items on the information sheet allow drill instructors,
treatment staff and trainees to have a clear set of expectations and creates a setting where
all can operate under the same set of rules and standards. By outlining these
expectations, rules, and standards, all involved in corrections process at TSCTC are
aware of the normative order.

The armed forces use a similar tool in which trainees learn the normative order of
the military. Rather than using an information sheet, the armed forces use a rather
lengthy book called the “smart book.” This book covers topics on education, field
training, military rank, codes of conduct and ethics, and survival skills. This smart book
must be memorized by trainees in the armed forces and much like the correctional
program at TSCTC, is used to set a standard of rules and expectations. While a
correlation can be seen when looking at the information sheet used by trainees at TSCTC,
the armed forces utilize this document to train skills a soldier will need for both the field
and a military career, not everyday society.

MAJOR THEMES: INTERVIEWS

In order to gain a further understanding about a correctional boot camp in general
and more specifically how a correctional boot camp compares to armed forces basic
training, interviews of drill instructors at TSCTC were conducted. As stated earlier, all
drill instructors at TSCTC have either been through armed forces basic training or
through a basic training designed for correctional boot camp employees. In conducting
interviews of individuals who knew the process in both the correctional setting and the armed forces setting, I was able to establish views about the program, how it compared to armed forces basic training, and if TSCTC had goals similar to the military. Three major themes became apparent through these interviews: structure, discipline, and treatment and education.

**Structure.** "Trainee's are told what to do from 5 a.m. until 10 p.m." When talking with drill instructors, this line was repeated over and over. At TSCTC, structure is paramount in the lives of the trainees. Many drill instructors discussed the necessity of teaching criminals how to develop structure within the program and out in society. During the course of the interviews, drill instructors shared many methods used at TSCTC.

One drill instructor commented, "We give them 15 minutes to eat, this doesn't give them any time for horsing around, and chow is always at the same time." Taking this statement further, he said, "It gives them something to look forward to; they never have to wonder." Another drill instructor talked about how the trainees began each day. "Every day they wake up at 5 a.m. Most of them are awake before that after a few days because they get used to the program. Even after they get out of here, they have developed a schedule, and after a body learns to do something, it's hard to break the habit."

Eating and sleeping were not the only forms of structure noted during interviews with the drill instructors. A number of those interviewed discussed a key aspect that they felt was taken directly from the military model. One drill instructor noted, "By getting them on a routine that they can use later, we can help these guys get in shape. A lot of
guys who come in here can barely do a push up. When they get done with this program, their bodies have changed, they can run, they can do sit-ups and push-ups and hopefully we have given them the means to continue this in their lives after TSCTC.” Another drill instructor explained, “We don’t make it easy on them, they have to participate with everyone else, but we have to push them, so they will continue to get better and so they don’t lose what they learn.”

Through interviewing drill instructors and staff at TSCTC it became clear to me that a main objective was to provide structure for trainees. A normal daily schedule and routine provides structure that can break habits created in a criminal lifestyle. For example, trainees at TSCTC get normal exercise and eat regular meals, which may or may not be the case on “the street.” Also, by teaching trainees healthy habits they are better prepared for life on the outside. A good illustration of this would be sleeping at night and waking at a normal hour. Keeping a schedule prepares trainees to live in society and find legitimate employment. Lastly, structure and learning how to apply this in daily life leads to the development of self-discipline.

*Discipline.* The concept of discipline was brought up a number of times as well during interviews with drill instructors. “Using the phrases ‘yes sir’ and ‘no sir’ really teaches these guys self discipline and respect. A lot of them hate authority and we have to break that down, get them to see that to get respect, they have to give it.” ‘Yes sir,’ and ‘no sir,’ are heard repeatedly at TCSTC. It is used as a tool to get trainees to recognize that someone else is in control and also as a tool that demands respect. Using these phrases may seem simple and of little use, but as in the military, trainees create a habit with repeating these words. According to the drill instructors at TSCTC, by forcing
the trainees to address authority figures with respect, trainees move away from old habits using offensive words such as “bro,” “chick,” and other touchy titles, and learn to communicate in a way that others will respond to positively.

Drill and ceremony was another area in which drill instructors discussed discipline. One drill instructor quoted, “When they learn to march in formation, to salute, to present the guidon and to raise the flag, they learn how to be disciplined and patriotic.” Another drill instructor commented on how important drill and ceremony was for trainees at TSCTC, stating, “Most of these guys have never had any kind of discipline let alone self-discipline. Drill and ceremony instills habits of precision and response to others and helps develop a sense of cohesion in trainees that most have never had before. They also learn about pride in what they are doing and in their team.”

Many drill instructors are also group facilitators at TSCTC. This affords drill instructors the ability to track trainee behavior from a drill setting—“the floor” to the treatment setting. It also gives trainees a sense of continuity between drill and treatment. In talking with the drill instructors, many noted how important self-discipline and holding self and others accountable was for trainees. Unlike the military, TSCTC has a policy of disclosure. Trainees are expected to “disclose” when they or other trainees are doing something wrong. “Disclosure is a big thing here. From the minute they walk in here they are told that if they are not up front and honest it will just be harder.” Many times these disclosures happen while in a groups setting as treatment groups are usually done in squads and not with all trainees. Drill instructors noted that by being in a drill setting as well as a treatment or educational setting with trainees, there were more opportunities to work with the participants to become leaders. “This is a short program and we don’t
have a lot of time to individualize. If we work with them in a number of different settings, we get them to work as a team, and the team has to help each other, if one person is screwing up, the group needs to figure it out. Also, by facilitating in a treatment setting and letting the group work on problems, we’re not always the one’s doing the confronting. These guys know when their peers are lying because they know what a lie looks like. They know what to look for and there’s no bullshitting a bullshitter.”

Much like structure, drill instructors agreed that discipline was a key function of the training at TSCTC. Not only does discipline reinforce structure in that it helps individuals to create healthy habits, it also provides for a sense of accomplishment. When an individual has a goal in mind, and the discipline to see that goal through to the end, the rewards can be infinite. At TSCTC, individuals learn that discipline is not only listening to and following someone else’s orders, they learn self-discipline. This self-discipline gives an individual the ability to make good choices, such as not doing drugs or waking up every morning to go to work. By providing discipline and the tools to be self-disciplined, TSCTC prepares trainees to make positive decisions when they return to their communities.

Treatment and education. Finally, treatment and education were discussed at length by all drill instructors. When asked, all stated that they felt the program was sixty percent treatment and education and forty percent drill and ceremony. Drill instructors also discussed how important it was to be a part of the treatment process. “We see these guys all day, every day. On the floor and in groups we get to really work on everything at once. These guys are like a closet with a bunch of junk inside. Our job is to clear it all out and get them down to four white walls. That’s their inner core.” Getting to the core
is done through groups such as “Cognitive Principles and Restructuring” or CP&R which is designed to teach convicted offenders to change their thoughts and behaviors, and victimology which helps offenders relate to and understand their victims.

Drill instructors discussed the fact that the armed forces teaches trainees different skills than those taught at TSCTC. “The military trains killers, our boot camp trains the opposite.” Drill instructors pointed out that the armed forces is in the business of protecting the country and that soldiers need to fight and survive. The correlation was made between TSCTC and the armed forces in that offenders have to learn how to survive, but that different skills are needed in different aspects of life. “We give them skills to use out in the world, not skills for a battlefield.” Recognizing that offenders are going to return to their communities, drill instructors noted that trainees need to be prepared for life. “They don’t just need to know about drill and ceremony, although it’s good for them. They need to know how to deal with problems they will face, issues that will come up. By exposing them to the boot camp life and integrating treatment, we can show them how they can live a normal life and not offend on the outside. . . . Graduates leave here with great self-esteem. They have accomplished something and sometimes that’s a first for them.”

ANALYSIS OF OPINIONS: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

As discussed earlier, the questionnaire (see Appendix 1) focused on two elements of correctional boot camps and how these reflect or are consistent with armed forces basic training: how drill instructors felt TSCTC compared and contrasted in organization and composition to the armed forces basic training model, and how the goals of each are
similar or not. Out of the 20 survey questionnaires that were distributed to staff at TSCTC, 13 were returned. As this was a very small sample size, percentages cannot be reported, nor can statistical analyses be reported. Nonetheless, the survey questionnaire was the guiding force for the observation and interviews that followed and it is useful to examine consistencies found in the questionnaires returned by respondents.

*Organization and composition.* MacKenzie and Herbert (1995) proposed that programs are correctional boot camps if they consist of at least the following four components: drill and ceremony, rigorous daily schedule, separation from the general population, and are considered an alternative to confinement. With these four components in mind, questions 1 through 4 in the survey questionnaire were developed. Returned survey questionnaires revealed that drill instructors consistently felt that TSCTC incorporated these components in the program although at least one respondent disagreed that TSCTC placed sufficient emphasis on military drill and ceremony.

Overall, it appears that TSCTC staff feel that the program incorporates the four components that MacKenzie and Herbert (1995) emphasize as distinguishing correctional boot camps from other shock incarceration programs.

*Evaluating the goals.* MacKenzie and Herbert (1995) further assert that program organization, dignity of the participant, drill instructor control, and participant responsibility are goals of the military that apply to correctional boot camp models. Questions 5 through 19 in the survey questionnaire look to the last three of these goals in ascertaining if drill instructors felt that these goals are a part of the TSCTC program. Questions 7, 8, 13 and 14 sought TSCTC staff opinions about control of trainees. These questions allude to how trainees are controlled and if both staff and participants recognize
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how this is accomplished in the program. About three quarters of respondents agreed that drill instructors are in control and that staff and participants recognize this. One question, regarding control brought about startling results. When asked if drill instructors were feared, most respondents agreed, but many put notes in the margins or in the comments section. These notes reflected that although drill instructors were feared, in time the fear turned to respect.

Questions 10, 11, 17, 18, and 19 all reflect the goal of dignity espoused by the military. Two of these questions looked to being treated as a soldier as a sense of dignity. All of the responses indicated that trainees are not treated as soldiers. Again, comments were made in the vein that TSCTC deals with inmates, “drug dealers, addicts and thieves.” Here, staff seems to be of the opinion that unlike the military, dignity is not a high priority. Question 19 reinforces this negation of dignity as a priority by asking staff if boot camp takes on the design of “tear them down and build them up again.” A majority of staff agreed or strongly agreed that this was a true statement, leading me to believe that although trainees are not given dignity on the outset, they can earn it over time.

Questions 5, 6, 12, 15, 16 and 20 attempt to find staffs opinions about participant responsibility. All respondents agreed that responsibility is a major program goal and that trainees learn responsibility while in the program. When asked specifically about rehabilitation goals, responsibility ranked high on the list of thirteen goals for all respondents.

Questions 21 and 22 were open ended and asked respondents to compare and contrast TSCTC to armed forces basic training. Many opinions given reflected that
although TSCTC was like the military in that they had structure, discipline, and drill and ceremony, the difference was in the fact that TSCTC deals with inmates and the focus is strong on treatment. Some respondents commented on the fact that trainees at TSCTC are put under stress much like soldiers in the military, but that the stress is more mental than physical. Finally, a number of respondents noted that the main goal of TSCTC is to facilitate change in trainee's behaviors and thinking. Many of these comments make sense as the two groups are working with two very different overall goals in mind. The armed forces is training individuals to become soldiers to protect the country, while TSCTC is preparing individuals who have been convicted of a crime to lead a healthier, crime free life.

CONCLUSION

Based on the literature review it is clear that correctional boot camps are a product of a long course of development in correctional history. This intermediate sanction is a clear reflection of contemporary correctional ideology which emphasizes public safety, accountability, and competency development—what is known as balanced and restorative justice. The military emphasizes accountability and competency development in their training, thus it makes for a good model for corrections to draw from.

Although not explicitly advanced in terms of theory, correctional boot camps embody social identity theory in their quest to change a convicted offenders identity from criminal to that of a member of a group with positive attitudes and behaviors. Much like the military, correctional boot camps take raw material and shape that into a person who has tools they can use. Where the military looks to make a group of individuals a fighting machine, one that protects the country and each other, TSCTC looks to create a
cohesive team that can help each other with issues and problems directly related to crime and criminal thoughts and behavior. Social identity theory is useful when describing TSCTC in that the program is literally attempting to create a new social identity for individuals in the corrections system.

TSCTC provides a practical application to examine both social identity theory and balance and restorative justice in a working model. Looking at TSCTC, using concepts of balanced and restorative justice, the program provides a strong base in preparing individuals in becoming responsible citizens while protecting the community. TSCTC also provides a setting in which identity development can be fostered. TSCTC provides an environment in which individuals are aligned with a new group in which different attitudes, values and behaviors are required and encouraged.

The research of this thesis includes an analysis of observations, interviews and an opinions survey of staff who are knowledgeable about a correctional boot camp program and have experience with armed forces basic training. The analysis looks to answer the questions of how correctional boot camps compare and contrast to armed forces basic training and if correctional boot camp staff feel that a specific correctional program reflect structure and goals espoused by armed forces basic training. Based on observations, interviews and the staff opinion surveys, results show that staff feels that TSCTC is modeled after armed forces basic training in structure and discipline, but that the correctional program puts more emphasis on treatment and education. TSCTC utilizes structure and discipline in an attempt to teach trainees how to create healthy habits in everyday society. Structure and discipline also provide tools for trainees to use when faced with difficult problems they may face on “the streets.” Using structure and
discipline as a foundation, TSCTC then focuses on treatment and education to change thoughts and behaviors. With a wide variety of treatment and education groups and classes, TSCTC works to help trainees deal with the problems they may face. Also, although goals are similar between the two programs, the objective for those goals is much different. TSCTC is a correctional training center and is not training individuals for a career in the military. Treatment is key above all else.

While this thesis is only a snapshot of one correctional program, I have completed this research in hopes that it may be used as a foundation for further research on a larger scale. There is still so much unknown about the relationships between the military and correctional boot camps. I hope this study has opened the door to others who may delve into the questions of how and why the military is used as a model for corrections.
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Appendix 1

Treasure State Correctional Training Center
Staff Opinion Survey

For questions 1-19 and 23, please indicate whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with each statement (or have no opinion). Please use the following scale to record your responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Treasure State Correctional Training Center places sufficient emphasis on military drill and ceremony.
   1  2  3  4  5

2. Treasure State Correctional Training Center does a good job of keeping program participants separated from the general prison population.
   1  2  3  4  5

3. Participants of Treasure State Correctional Training Center would likely be incarcerated at Montana State Prison if they were not in the program.
   1  2  3  4  5

4. Treasure State Correctional Training Center places sufficient emphasis on a rigorous daily schedule of hard labor and physical training for trainees.
   1  2  3  4  5

5. Individuals who complete the program have learned valuable lessons and skills.
   1  2  3  4  5

6. Individuals who complete the program have more positive attitudes.
   1  2  3  4  5

7. Staff has a good understanding of the phases of the program and how trainees move through those phases.
   1  2  3  4  5

8. Trainees have a good understanding of the phases of the program by which they make progress.
   1  2  3  4  5

9. Drill Instructors provide role models to emulate.
   1  2  3  4  5
10. Trainees are treated more like soldiers than inmates.
   1 2 3 4 5

11. The inmate is treated as a soldier.
   1 2 3 4 5

12. Trainee's learn and develop self-discipline.
   1 2 3 4 5

13. Drill Instructors are feared.
   1 2 3 4 5

14. The staff maintains total control over the trainee's activities.
   1 2 3 4 5

15. Trainees learn to accept responsibility for their actions.
   1 2 3 4 5

16. Trainees learn cooperation and teamwork.
   1 2 3 4 5

17. Rewards are used more frequently than punishment to alter trainees' behavior.
   1 2 3 4 5

18. Building on a trainee's strength is more important than playing on a trainee's weakness.
   1 2 3 4 5

19. The idea of boot camp is to "tear them down and build them up again."
   1 2 3 4 5

For questions 20-22, please write your answer in the space provided. If you feel you have more to add then there is space, please feel free to use a separate sheet of paper.

20. The following is a list of common rehabilitation goals. Please rank these goals by how important you feel they are at Treasure State Correctional Treatment Camp. (1=Most Important, 13=Least Important)
   Empathy ___ Chemical Dependency Treatment ___
   Structure ___ Vocational Training ___
   Discipline ___ Responsibility ___
   Self-Concept ___ Accountability ___
   Education ___ Service ___
   Honesty ___ Integrity ___
   Teamwork ___ Other: __________________________
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21. How is the program at Treasure State Correctional Training Camp similar to armed forces basic training?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

22. How is the program at Treasure State Correctional Training Camp different to armed forces basic training?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

23. Overall, Treasure State Correctional Treatment Camp does a good job at rehabilitating offenders before releasing them back into society.

1  2  3  4  5

If you have any other comments to make, use the space below.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Appendix 2

Treasure State Correctional Training Center
Information Sheet

TREASURE STATE CORRECTIONAL TRAINING CENTER
Trainee is required to know this information

Eight General Rules
1. Always acknowledge orders by saying "Yes, Sir/No, Sir" or "Yes, Ma'am/No, Ma'am."
2. Always say, "Excuse me, Sir/Ma'am" when passing staff from the front and "By your leave, Sir/Ma'am" when passing staff from the rear.
3. When addressing staff, always ask for permission to speak.
4. After receiving orders, take one step back, do an about face, and wait for permission to leave.
5. When encountering visitors, do not speak unless authorized by staff.
6. Never gape at visitors; continue with the assignment.
7. When a staff member enters the housing unit, call the unit to attention.
8. Read and understand all the rules and regulations of C.T.C.

5 Deterrents (Thinking Deterrents)
1. Stop the action.
2. Think it out.
3. Take an honest look at yourself.
4. Don't look for trouble.
5. Automatic deterrents.

5 Big Truths
1. I am here because of what I did—nobody else.
2. I am in C.T.C. and if I do not change, I will be in prison a long time.
3. Life is not fair. How I deal with it is what matters.
4. I have one choice—change.
5. All of my life I have taken the easy way out, but if I am willing to make better choices and work hard for the rest of my life, I can be successful.

9 Foundation Errors (Thinking Errors)
1. Self centeredness
2. Power and control
3. Victimstance
4. Anger
5. Concrete thinking
6. Sentimentality
7. Fear
8. Dehumanization
9. Entitlement

Definitions
1. Empathy - the ability to see and feel the world through another person's eyes.
2. Discipline - the instant, willful obedience to all orders, respect for authority, and self-reliance.
3. Responsibility - choosing to meet my obligations without complaints or excuses.
4. Accountability - I will take the credit or the blame for my actions.
5. Teamwork - to sacrifice personal gain for the good of the team.
6. Integrity - doing the right thing even when no one else is looking.
7. Service - helping others in a meaningful way.
8. Honesty - genuine and real, free from deception.