

152809

**CALIFORNIA'S JUVENILE PROBATION CAMPS:**

**A VALIDATION STUDY**

**PART I: COUNTIES OTHER THAN LOS ANGELES**

**NCJRS**

**FEB 14 1995**

**ACQUISITIONS**

**State of California  
Department of the Youth Authority  
Research Division**

**July 1994**

**California's Juvenile Probation Camps:  
A Validation Study**

**Part I: Counties Other Than Los Angeles**

by

**Robert Wedge and Ted Palmer**

152809

**U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice**

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

California Department of the  
Youth Authority

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

**State of California  
Department of the Youth Authority  
Research Division**

**July 1994**

CAMPS, RANCHES, AND SCHOOLS RESEARCH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Robert G. Gillen, Chief Probation Officer  
Sonoma County Probation Department

- Chairperson

Joseph C. Jiminez, Chief Probation Officer (Retired)  
Tulare County Probation Department

James Brewer, Director of Institutions (Retired)  
Yuba County Probation Department

Gerald S. Buck, County Probation Officer  
Contra Costa County Probation Department

Paul D. Green, Chief Probation Officer (Retired)  
Alameda County Probation Department

Jerry D. Hill, Chief Probation Officer (Retired)  
San Bernardino County Probation Department

Don Hogner, Chief Probation Officer (Retired)  
Alameda County Probation Department

Gwen Kurz, Director/Research Division  
Orange County Probation Department

Roger Palomino, Director  
Juvenile Services Division  
Fresno County Probation Department

Larry Price, Chief Probation Officer  
Tulare County Probation Department

Charles Richards, Probation Division Director (Retired)  
Contra Costa County Probation Department

Jack Sanders, Director (Retired)  
Los Cerros Boys' Ranch  
Alameda County Probation Department

Pete Silva, Chief Probation Officer (Retired)  
Santa Clara County Probation Department

Ted L. Smith, Chief Probation Officer (Retired)  
Placer County Probation Department

Herbert Zipperstein, Director (Retired)  
Dorothy Kirby Center  
Los Angeles County Probation Department

James K. Custer, Chief Probation Officer (Retired)  
Del Norte County Probation Department

- former Chairperson

# CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	v
SUMMARY .....	vii
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. BACKGROUND.....	3
Methods .....	4
Glossary .....	5
III. POST-CAMP OUTCOMES.....	7
Youth Characteristics.....	7
Post-Camp Outcomes .....	9
IV. CAMP-TYPE VALIDATION.....	13
Validation Process .....	13
Validated Camp-Types.....	13
Similarities and Differences Among Camp-Types .....	14
Camp Youth Samples Used for Validation .....	17
Full vs. Partial Validation.....	17
V. CAMP-TYPE DESCRIPTIONS.....	19
Non-LA Camp-Type A.....	19
Non-LA Camp-Type B .....	22
Non-LA Camp-Type C .....	24
Non-LA Camp-Type D.....	26
Results by Risk-Level Across Camp-Types .....	28
VI. UTILIZING INFORMATION ON CAMP-TYPES .....	31
Selecting a Camp-Type.....	31
VII. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS.....	35
Discussion .....	35
Implications .....	35

CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
REFERENCES .....	39
APPENDIX A: Research Methods.....	41
APPENDIX B: Recidivism Risk Scale .....	47
APPENDIX C: Post-Camp Outcomes for 1982 and 1984 Camp Samples in Counties Other Than Los Angeles.....	49
APPENDIX D: Definitions of Camp Characteristics.....	51
APPENDIX E: Development of Camp-Types and Validation Methods .....	57
APPENDIX F: Camps With Highest Scores on Each of Four Validated Camp-Types for Counties Other Than Los Angeles.....	61
APPENDIX G: Post-Camp Outcomes by Camp-Type for 1982 and 1984 Samples (Counties Other Than Los Angeles).....	63
APPENDIX H: Integrating the Information: An Example.....	67

## LIST OF TABLES

		<u>Page</u>
TABLE 1:	Characteristics of Youths in the 1982 and 1984 Camp Samples in Counties Other Than Los Angeles.....	8
TABLE 2:	Recidivism and State Commitment Rates at 24-Months Follow-up for 1982 and 1984 Satisfactory Releases, by Level of Recidivism Risk.....	10
TABLE 3:	Sustained Petitions for Violent Offenses Prior to Camp Admission and Following Release for 1982 and 1984 Samples.....	12
TABLE 4:	Composition of Camp-Types for Counties Other Than Los Angeles: Features, by Direction .....	15
TABLE 5:	Camps Achieving Positive Outcomes: Non-LA Type A .....	20
TABLE 6:	Validation Data for Non-LA Camp-Type A.....	21
TABLE 7:	Camps Achieving Positive Outcomes: Non-LA Type B.....	23
TABLE 8:	Validation Data for Non-LA Camp-Type B .....	23
TABLE 9:	Camps Achieving Positive Outcomes: Non-LA Type C.....	25
TABLE 10:	Validation Data for Non-LA Camp-Type C .....	26
TABLE 11:	Camps Achieving Positive Outcomes: Non-LA Type D .....	27
TABLE 12:	Validation Data for Non-LA Camp-Type D.....	28
TABLE 13:	Percentage of Each Recidivism Risk Level in Typical Camp Population in Counties Other Than Los Angeles.....	31
TABLE 14:	Camp-Types With Better Post-Camp Outcomes, by Youth Risk Level .....	33



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to thank the Chief Probation Officers of California for their support of the Probation Camps Validation Study. We would also like to thank the Camps, Ranches, and Schools Research Advisory Committee for its excellent suggestions and support. A very special thanks goes to all the probation camp staff who patiently and diligently supplied the study with data necessary for the completion of this report.



## SUMMARY

In 1984, 23 counties (including Los Angeles County) operated a total of 53 camps throughout the state. Where these non-state-mandated camps exist, they provide the juvenile court with an alternative disposition other than return-to-home or Youth Authority commitment.

This study is an extension of an earlier descriptive and evaluative study of county-operated juvenile probation camps by the Department of the Youth Authority's Research Division. The study, which had been requested by the Chief Probation Officers of California, presented characteristics of youths in camps in 1984 and outcome data for youths released from camps in 1982. One of the goals achieved by the study was the identification of types of camp programs with significantly more positive outcomes than other camps, that is, with lower recidivism and state commitment rates.

The present study was designed to obtain recidivism and state commitment rates on a sample of randomly selected youths released from camps in 1984. The study's primary purpose was to validate findings of the earlier study by determining if types of camps with more positive outcomes with 1982 releases also had more positive outcomes with the 1984 sample. If so, the findings and implications would have more certainty for policy purposes.

In order to carry out this study, it was necessary to replicate the 1982 study in many of its details. Outcome data were collected on the 1984 sample, and the same statistical analyses used in the 1982 study were repeated to validate the characteristics of more successful camps identified in the earlier study. The findings and implications of this study are presented below and in the concluding section. This document—Part I of the validation study report—includes data on camps in counties other than Los Angeles County. Part II includes data on Los Angeles County camps. Los Angeles County was the only county with a large enough sample size to be analyzed separately. Moreover, the earlier study found important differences between Los Angeles County camps and camps in other counties.

### Youth Characteristics

- Study findings indicate that youths released from probation camps in 1984 differed slightly—but significantly—from 1982 releases. The 1984 group:
  - was younger at first sustained petition
  - had fewer prior sustained petitions
  - had lower risk-of-recidivism scores
  - included more youths committed for person offenses
  - was older when released from camp.

### Post-Camp Outcomes for Counties Other Than Los Angeles

- Average length of stay in a camp program by satisfactory releases increased from 5.0 months (151 days) in 1982 to 5.6 months (171 days) in 1984.
- In 1984, the recidivism rate for counties other than Los Angeles at 24-months follow-up was 57.5%, a figure significantly lower than the 64.7% rate found for the 1982 sample. (Recidivism is defined as a sustained petition in juvenile court or a conviction in adult court.) The state commitment rate was also lower: 20.0% vs. 16.0% in 1984.
- When outcomes were compared by risk level, recidivism rates for medium and higher risks (but not for lower risks) were significantly lower in 1984 than in 1982. In 1984, state commitment rates were significantly lower only for lower risks.
- In the 24 months following camp release in 1982, violent offending decreased by 50% compared to the 24 months prior to camp admission. For the 1984 release group, violent offending decreased by almost 21%.

### Camp-Type Findings

- This study validated four independent types of probation camp programs in counties other than Los Angeles that had better outcomes than other camp programs in both 1982 and 1984. Outcomes presented below are for the 1984 release sample.

- Camps with characteristics closely matching those of Type A had a 24-month recidivism rate—for all youths combined—that was, on average, 11.5 percentage points less than that found for camps unlike Type A: 52.4% vs. 63.9%. Also, for lower risk youths, Type A camps had recidivism rates 18.9 points less than those for camps unlike Type A. For higher risk youths, Type A's recidivism rates were 13.5 points less.
- Type B camps had recidivism rates for higher risk youths that were 19.5 points less than for such youths in non-Type B camps.
- In Type C camps, lower state commitment rates were found for lower risks (1.6% vs. 10.6%), for higher risks (18.7% vs. 44.6%), and, for all risks combined (12.6% vs. 22.4%).
- Camp-type D was shown to have lower recidivism rates for lower risks (34.4% vs. 50.6%) and, to some extent, lower state commitment rates for higher risks.

### Implications

Overall, this validation study found that, in the counties which operate juvenile probation camps, public protection is provided through incarceration and incapacitation of delinquent youths and by a reduction in delinquent behavior during a 24-month period following completion of the camp program. Juvenile probation camps also provide institutional programs for some youths who, in the absence of these camps, would most likely be committed to state institutions.

The validation process identified several "types" of camp programs found to have recidivism and state commitment rates significantly and statistically lower than other camps. This suggests that camps with higher recidivism or commitment rates could reduce those rates by adopting the characteristics of these more successful camp-types. Achieving lower recidivism rates would provide more public protection.

## I. INTRODUCTION

This report presents probation outcomes for a large sample of youths who resided in California's county juvenile probation camps in July 1984. The purpose of the study was to compare these outcomes with those of a cohort of youths released from camps in 1982 and to validate earlier findings on the relationship between camp characteristics and positive post-camp outcomes. This purpose is relevant to questions that have been raised about local juvenile justice programs, such as:

- How may counties enhance their handling of juvenile offenders at the local level in order to reduce unnecessary penetration into the justice system while continuing to provide public protection?
- Are there existing camp programs whose features can be implemented and adapted by other camps in order to achieve reductions in recidivism and commitment to state institutions?



## II. BACKGROUND

Beginning in 1984, the Department of the Youth Authority's Research Division conducted a descriptive and evaluative study of juvenile probation camps which had been requested by the Chief Probation Officers of California. This study was based on outcomes for a sample of youths released in 1982 from 14 camps in Los Angeles County and 32 camps in 20 other counties.<sup>1</sup> The analyses found important differences between Los Angeles County camps and camps in other counties, in the characteristics of both camps and youths. As youths released from Los Angeles County camps represented 43% of the release cohort, their presence in the analysis would have heavily influenced the validation findings for camp-types. As a result, Los Angeles County camps were analyzed separately from camps in other counties. This document presents findings for camps in counties other than Los Angeles. Findings for Los Angeles County camps appear in Part II of the Validation Study.

One component of the earlier study was a report on recidivism and state commitment rates for youths released from camps in 1982. For male youths who satisfactorily completed camp programs in counties other than Los Angeles, the average recidivism rate was 64.7% during the 24-month period following release. During the same follow-up period, 20.0% were committed to state institutions.

However, results also showed that some camps had lower recidivism and/or commitment rates than others. In addition, it was found that certain sets of interrelated camp characteristics were significantly related to positive post-camp outcomes, particularly for certain types of youths. These sets of characteristics were used to define a series of "camp-types."

In order to increase the degree of confidence in these initial findings, the Research Division undertook a validation study as a follow-up and adjunct to the original study. The current report presents the findings of the validation process for camp programs in counties other than Los Angeles. The three primary goals of the validation study were:

---

<sup>1</sup>See references for a list of reports on the Probation Camps Study.

1. To compare recidivism and state commitment rates for the 1982 camp release cohort with those of a totally different sample of youths released in 1984.<sup>2</sup>
2. To determine if the camps that had more positive outcomes with the 1982 sample also had more positive outcomes with the 1984 release sample.
3. To identify one or more sets of camp characteristics (camp-types) related to better outcomes in both the 1982 and 1984 samples.

If the results of this study show that the original camp-types have significantly better outcomes with both samples, they will have been statistically validated and, as a result, information related to these camp-types could be used with considerable confidence. The implication is that camps which adopt the characteristics of a more successful camp-type might then achieve more positive post-camp outcomes, that is, lower recidivism rates, lower state commitment rates, or both.

### Methods

The research methods used in this study are described in Appendix A. These methods are a replication of those used in the first camps study. Readers interested in greater detail pertaining to research methods are referred to California's Juvenile Probation Camps Study Report No. 4. Some of the terms used in this report are defined in a glossary on the following page.

---

<sup>2</sup>A small portion of all youths who resided in the probation camps on July 20, 1984 were released from those camps in 1985. However, since the vast majority were released in 1984, the validation sample will be termed 1984 releases.

---

## GLOSSARY

ADJUSTED RATES	This refers to recidivism or state commitment rates that have been statistically adjusted using analysis of covariance. Covariance procedures adjust actual rates by controlling for differences in characteristics of the groups. This results in an estimate of what the rates might be if the groups were similar with respect to the specified characteristics being controlled.
CAMP-TYPE	Defined by a set of camp characteristics which, interacting together, have been found to be related to more positive probation outcomes. A camp may be scored on a camp-type based on the presence or absence of specific characteristics.
COMMITMENT	A court commitment to the Youth Authority or the Department of Corrections.
RECIDIVISM	A sustained petition in court for a juvenile or a conviction in adult court.
RECIDIVISM RISK	A score based on the statistical probability that a youth with certain background characteristics will recidivate. The scale ranges from 1 to 8, with higher scores denoting a greater likelihood of recidivism. See Appendix B (Recidivism Risk Scale).
SATISFACTORY RELEASE	Generally, a graduate from the camp program. Any youth not removed from camp for disciplinary reasons. This does not imply "honorable discharge" but rather indicates completion of a specified term of confinement.
VARIABLE WEIGHT	Variable weights appear in the tables listing the characteristics of each camp-type. These are statistical measures representing the relative importance of the variable in defining the camp-type. It is a measure of the variable's strength of association with positive post-camp outcomes.

---

Note: Further information about these terms may be found in Probation Camps Study Report No. 4.



### III. POST-CAMP OUTCOMES

#### Youth Characteristics

Characteristics of youths in the 1984 validation sample were compared with those of the original 1982 camp sample. Results are displayed in Table 1. These comparisons indicate that there were statistical differences between the two samples on all characteristics available for examination, with the lone exception of percentage of youths with prior institutional commitments. Compared to the 1982 sample, the 1984 sample:

- was younger at first sustained petition
- had fewer prior sustained petitions, an average of 1.6 vs. 1.9 for the 1982 sample
- had a larger percentage with prior violent offenses
- had a larger percentage of current commitment petitions for person offenses
- was slightly older at time of release from camp
- had a lower score on the risk-of-recidivism scale.

The 1984 sample contained a larger percentage of youths with prior violent offenses and also had a larger percentage whose current commitment was for person-related offenses. A comparison of background characteristics showed that the 1984 sample had a slightly lower recidivism risk score, which is related to a lower probability of recidivism for any type of subsequent offense. On the other hand, the actual difference in scores—4.5 vs. 4.3—was quite small and would have had little effect when youths were grouped for analysis into lower, medium, and higher risk categories. See Appendix B for a discussion of the recidivism risk scale.

Although not a youth characteristic, average length of stay (LOS) in camp was also compared. The 1984 sample had a somewhat longer stay, 5.6 vs. 5.0 months (171 vs. 151 days). It is not known whether the increase in LOS was due to a change in camp programs or policies, or to a change in youth characteristics.

TABLE 1

Characteristics of Youths in the 1982 and 1984 Camp Samples  
in Counties Other Than Los Angeles

Youth Characteristics		Camp Sample	
		1982	1984
Sample Size	No.	1,206	1,095
Avg. Age at 1st Sustained Petition	Avg.	14.8	14.4 *
Pct. with 1 or More Prior Sustained Petitions Excluding Commitment Offense	%	81.0	75.6 *
Avg. No. of Prior Sustained Petitions	Avg.	1.9	1.6 *
Pct. with Prior Institutional Commitment	%	29.8	33.9 n.s.
Pct. with 1 or more Prior Violent Offenses Including Commitment Offense	%	29.4	33.9 *
Type of Commitment Offense: Person	%	11.4	22.8 *
Property	%	60.3	58.9
Drugs	%	8.7	7.8
Other	%	19.7	10.5
Ag at Release from Camp	Avg.	16.1	16.3 *
Length of Stay in Days	Avg.	151	171 *
Avg. Recidivism Risk Scale Score	Avg.	4.5	4.3 *

\*Difference between samples is statistically significant. (n.s. indicates difference is non-significant.)

Note. It is coincidental that 33.9% pertains both to prior violent offenses and prior institutional commitment. The 33.9% does not necessarily comprise the same youths.

**Research implications.** Findings of significant differences between the 1982 and 1984 samples do not detract from the validation analyses on more successful camp-types presented later in this report. In fact, if camp-types that had more positive outcomes with the 1982 sample also had more positive outcomes with the 1984 sample—which differs significantly from the 1982 sample in several characteristics—the validation of those camp-types can be considered even more reliable and generalizable.

### **Post-Camp Outcomes**

This section presents comparisons between post-camp outcomes after 24 months follow-up for the 1982 and 1984 samples. The comparisons focus on youths who were satisfactorily released from camp. This focus provides comparability because the development of camp-types in the earlier study was associated with 24-month outcomes for satisfactory releases. Outcomes for unsatisfactory removals and for the total camp sample are found in Appendix Table C-1.

**Recidivism and state commitment.** Table 2 presents a comparison of the recidivism and state commitment rates for the two samples. The recidivism rate is significantly lower for total satisfactory releases in 1984: 57.5% had one or more sustained petitions or convictions within 24 months, compared to 64.7% for the 1982 sample. The difference between the state commitment rate within 24 months, 16.0% in 1984 and 20.0% in 1982, is also statistically significant. In comparisons of outcomes for total releases, group differences in risk of recidivism were statistically controlled.

It was important to determine if the differences in outcomes for 1982 and 1984 might have resulted from differences in the characteristics of the youths in the two samples, especially if the lower recidivism for the 1984 group was simply due to a lower overall risk of recidivism for that group. Previously, Table 1 showed that the characteristics of the 1984 sample differed significantly from those of the 1982 group. However, the average risk of recidivism score was nearly the same: 4.5 in 1982 and 4.3 in 1984. While this difference is statistically significant, the practical difference is negligible.

While the difference in recidivism risk score for the two samples—4.5 in 1982 and 4.3 in 1984—is statistically significant, the practical difference is negligible. Nevertheless, in comparisons of outcomes for total releases, group differences in risk of recidivism were statistically controlled.

TABLE 2

Recidivism and State Commitment Rates at 24-Months Follow-up  
for 1982 and 1984 Satisfactory Releases,  
by Level of Recidivism Risk

Risk Level	Sample	N	Recidivism		Commitment	
			N	%	N	%
Total Satisfactory Releases	1982	1,206	780	64.7*	241	20.0*
	1984	1,095	630	57.5	175	16.0
Lower Risks	1982	293	148	50.5	37	12.6*
	1984	303	142	46.9	22	7.3
Medium Risks	1982	664	437	65.8*	125	18.8
	1984	576	343	59.6	98	17.0
Higher Risks	1982	249	195	78.3*	79	31.7
	1984	216	145	67.1	55	25.5

\*Significant at the .05 level. Actual rates are shown.

**Outcomes by risk level.** To further account for any effects due to differences in risk of recidivism between the two samples, the youths were grouped by lower, medium, and higher risk level; and outcomes for 1982 and 1984 were compared within each group. These outcomes, listed in Table 2, show that recidivism rates remained lower in 1984 for each risk group; differences were statistically significant for the medium and higher risk groups. Differences in state commitment rate, while also lower in 1984 for each risk level, were statistically significant only among lower risks.

Rates for each risk level were also compared at 6-, 12-, and 18-months follow-up. Rates at each period were lower for the 1984 sample, and the differences were statistically significant for

medium and higher risks. Outcomes by risk group for the various follow-up periods are shown in Appendix Table C-2.

**Discussion.** In counties other than Los Angeles, recidivism rates for satisfactory releases from the 1984 sample were lower than in 1982. When outcomes were examined for youths grouped by risk of recidivism, recidivism rates for the 1984 sample continued to be lower. It can be concluded that camps achieved lower recidivism rates—and, to a lesser extent, lower commitment rates—in 1984 than in 1982.<sup>3</sup> It also appears that the lower rates in 1984 cannot necessarily be attributed to the generally lower degree of delinquent characteristics in the 1984 sample.

**Violent offenses.** The comparison of outcomes also included an examination of violent offenses and the possible reduction of violent offending following satisfactory release from a camp program. Violent offenses include homicide, assault, robbery, rape, and kidnapping.

Table 3 shows measures of violent offending for both the 1982 and 1984 samples. Shown are the number of youths with one or more sustained petitions for a violent offense and the total number of violent offenses occurring during a 24-month period prior to admission to camp. These figures are contrasted with the number of violent offenders and violent offenses occurring during the 24-month period following camp release.

The data indicate that for the 1982 sample the number of violent offenders decreased 50.8% from the pre- to post-period, and the number of violent offenses decreased 50.4%. Violent offending was also reduced for the 1984 sample, but the decreases were not statistically significant: violent offenders down 24.9%; violent offenses down 21.1%.

---

<sup>3</sup>The differences in recidivism rate for the risk groups were at a statistical probability level of .05 or lower, meaning that the odds of such differences occurring by chance alone in different samples were less than 5 in 100.

TABLE 3

Sustained Petitions for Violent Offenses  
Prior to Camp Admission and Following Release  
for 1982 and 1984 Samples

Time Period	1982 Sample		1984 Sample	
	No. of Youths	No. of Viol. Petitions	No. of Youths	No. of Viol. Petitions
24 Mos. Prior to Camp	317	371	221	242
24 Mos. Following Release	156	184	166	191
Decrease*	N	161	55	51
	%	-50.8	-24.9	-21.1

\*Decrease in number of violent offenders was statistically significant in 1982 but not in 1984.

It is recognized that those who committed violent offenses during follow-up may have quickly been reincarcerated and, therefore, not at-large to commit another offense, violent or otherwise. Nevertheless, the data show reductions in violent behavior following camp release for both the 1982 and 1984 samples.

Nonviolent offenders were nearly as likely as violent offenders to commit a subsequent violent offense. Other measures relative to the incidence of violent behavior are listed below:

<u>Measure</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1984</u>
Pct. of sample with prior violent offense	26.3%	20.2%
Of those with prior violence, pct. who committed violent offense after release	16.4%	18.1%
Of those with no prior violence, pct. who committed a violent offense after release	11.7%	14.4%

## IV. CAMP-TYPE VALIDATION

### Validation Process

The initial Juvenile Probation Camps Study identified several camps that had significantly better outcomes than other camps. Camps that had better outcomes with the 1982 sample generally were among those with more positive outcomes with the 1984 sample. The more successful camps were grouped into "camp-types" based on similarities in characteristics. This concept of camp-types was then tested by subjecting them to a set of stringent validation procedures. These procedures are described in Appendix E. Of the original ten types identified in counties other than Los Angeles, four maintained their statistical significance in the replication process and can be considered validated.

These key points pertain to the four validated camp-types:

- Camps with high scores on any of these four camp-types had significantly better outcomes for youths of specified risk levels and for all youths combined in the 1982 sample than did other camps.
- Camps with high scores on those same four camp-types in 1982 also had significantly better outcomes for corresponding risk level groups, using the 1984 sample.

### Validated Camp-Types

In the next section, the four validated camp-types for counties other than Los Angeles are described. Outcomes for camps with high scores on each camp-type scale are compared with those for camps with low scores using the 1982 sample and again with the 1984 sample. In all analyses, rates displayed have been statistically adjusted in an attempt to take into account any relevant group differences. See Glossary (page 5) for an explanation of "adjusted" rates.

Table 4 lists the camp characteristics that comprise each of the four validated camp-types. The characteristics are grouped into categories: General Features (many being physical in nature, and difficult to modify); Program Features (eight program components measured both in hours

and frequency); and Other Features (such as youth-to-staff ratio and aftercare elements). Each camp characteristic is defined in Appendix D and described in greater detail in the Probation Camps Study Report No. 4.

### **Similarities and Differences Among Camp-Types**

Part of the validation was to determine whether the process of developing camp-types had simply identified a single cluster of characteristics related to a single group of camps with uniformly better outcomes (commonality of items). In other words, it was necessary to determine whether the four validated camp-types were not just four different configurations of a single cluster of camp characteristics. It was also important to ascertain that the camps that scored high on each camp-type were not just the same group of more successful camps (commonality of camps).

**Commonality of items.** By examining Table 4, a simple check on the commonality of items across the four camp-types demonstrated that, while not totally independent, each camp-type was a unique mixture of characteristics. Of the 32 available camp characteristics, 29 appeared on at least one of the camp-type scales. No single characteristic was positively related to all four camp-types; three were related to none.

TABLE 4  
Composition of Camp-Types for Counties Other Than Los Angeles:  
Features, by Direction

Camp Feature	Type A	Type B	Type C	Type D
<b><u>GENERAL FEATURES</u></b>				
Camp Capacity		Smaller	Smaller	Smaller
Total Capacity Used			Higher	
Living Unit Capacity			Larger	
No. of Living Units	Single			Single
Living Arrangement			Rooms	
Length of Stay	Longer			Longer
Physical Setting				Rural
<b><u>PROGRAM FEATURES<sup>a</sup></u></b>				
Counseling	- Hours Freq.		Lower	Lower
Vocational	- Hours Freq.	Fewer	Higher	
Work Activities	- Hours Freq.	More Higher	More	Fewer
Academic	- Hours Freq.			Fewer
Religious	- Hours Freq.		More	Higher
Recreation	- Hours Freq.	More		Higher Fewer Higher
Offgrounds	- Hours Freq.	Higher		More
Outside Contacts	- Hours Freq.	Higher		Higher More Higher
<b><u>OTHER FEATURES</u></b>				
Total Youth/Staff Ratio		Higher Ratio		Lower Ratio
Treatment Youth/Staff Ratio			Lower Ratio	
Volunteer Services				More
Program Assignment			Individual	
Case Review				
Program Progress				Stages
Post-camp Supervision	Lower			
Pre-plus-post-camp Supervision	Higher			
Pct. Camp Caseload				

<sup>a</sup>Appendix D provides information on the average number of hours or frequency of occurrence for the program features. For instance, camps with "more hours of work activities" are defined as having an average of 15.9 hours of work activities per youth per week. Three variables were not associated with any of the four types: hours of counseling, case review, and pct. camp caseload.

The list following further demonstrates the independence of the camp-type scales. For instance, in a comparison of camp-types A and B, only one item appears on both scales. On the other hand, there are 14 items that appear only on one scale or the other.

<u>Camp-Type Pair Being Compared</u>	<u>Items Appearing on Both Camp-Types</u>	<u>Items on Only One of the Pair of Camp-Types</u>
Types A & B	1	14
Types A & C	0	21 (2)*
Types A & D	4	13
Types B & C	2	14 (1)*
Types B & D	1	14 (1)*
Types C & D	1	22

\*There were one or two items that appeared on both camp-type scales, but were scored in opposite directions, such as more vs. fewer hours of work activities.

These figures tend to point to a quite satisfactory degree of independence or uniqueness among the four camp-type scales. The pair of scales with the most similarity, Types A and D, had four items in common, but 13 other items were associated with only one or the other of the two scales.

Commonality of camps. The other question was whether the same set of successful camps appeared in the top third of scores on each camp-type scale. The answer to that question is no, but there was some repetition; that is, some camps indeed did appear on more than one scale.

- 2 camps were in top third on all four types.
- 5 camps were in top third on three types.
- 6 camps were in top third on two types.
- 8 camps were in the top third of scores on one type only.
- 11 camps were not in the top third of scores on any type.

In an examination limited to the five highest-scoring camps on each type, it was found that no camps appeared on all four of the types, two camps appeared on three types, one camp appeared on two types, and the remaining camps appeared on only one type, exclusive of all others.

### **Camp Youth Samples Used for Validation**

For the validated camp-types, outcomes are shown for three youth samples, defined as follows:

- 1982 - A cohort of 1,026 youths released from 28 camps in counties other than Los Angeles during 1982. Four camps were excluded because they had missing data on some camp characteristics.
- 1984 - A sample of 957 youths released from the same 28 camps included in the 1982 sample.
- 1984 (Revised) - 1,095 youths released from 32 camps in 1984. The four camps previously deleted were now included because they were no longer missing any variables in any of the four camp-types.

### **Full vs. Partial Validation**

Full validation indicates that a camp-type had significantly lower recidivism or commitment rates in all three samples: 1982, 1984, and 1984-revised.

Partial validation indicates that a camp-type achieved lower rates in the 1982 sample and in one of the 1984 samples. This level of validation is still considered satisfactory. These terms will be used when describing individual camp-types in the following section.



## V. CAMP-TYPE DESCRIPTIONS

As indicated, all camp-types in this report are derived from counties other than Los Angeles. The camp-types are labeled A, B, C, and D and are denoted as Non-LA Camp-Types. Validation Study Report Part II contains descriptions of Los Angeles camp-types.

### Non-LA Camp-Type A

Camp-type A was derived using the statistical technique of analysis of regression on recidivism for all youths of any risk level in the 1982 sample. A similar regression was performed using the 1984 sample. The camp characteristics identified in the two regressions were combined, resulting in a composite camp-type.

Characteristics of Non-LA Camp-Type A. Salient program features of Camp-type A are Physical Activities and Community Ties. Table 5 lists the individual characteristics of camps classified as Type A. Also shown is each variable's weight or relative importance in defining the camp-type. See the Glossary on page 5 for a discussion of "variable weight." Camp characteristics are defined in Appendix D.

Camps grouped as Type A typically have a single living unit and keep youths in the program longer than average (7.1 months—213 days or more). The program emphasizes recreation, work activities, and opportunities to go outside the camp. Vocational training comprises little or no part of the overall program. Measures of the two aftercare variables listed in Table 5 seem contradictory. That is, the scale includes a lower measure of strictly post-camp services but a higher measure of pre-release combined with post-camp services. This may indicate that aftercare had greater impact on recidivism when linked with pre-release services (camp plus post-camp) than when starting at point of the youth's release from camp (post-camp).

TABLE 5

## Camps Achieving Positive Outcomes: Non-LA Type A

Features	Type, Amount, Direction	Weight
<u>GENERAL FEATURES</u>		
Number of living units	single unit	10.0
Length of stay	longer: 213 or more days	6.9
<u>PROGRAM FEATURES</u>		
Recreation	more hours: 19.7 avg.	6.5
Outside contacts	higher freq.: 2.3 avg.	4.7
Vocational training	fewer hours: 0.6 avg.	4.3
Offgrounds activities	higher freq.: 1.5 avg.	2.8
Work activities	more hours: 15.9 avg.	2.6*
Work activities	higher freq.: 7.2 avg.	
<u>POST-CAMP SUPERVISION</u>		
Post-camp	lower	7.6
Camp plus post-camp	higher	4.4

\*Both more hours and higher frequency of work activities must be present.

Note on aftercare measures. Generally, consensus would support a positive relationship between aftercare services and post-camp outcomes. However, aftercare appeared as a defining characteristic only for Type A camps and, even there, one of the two measures was in the opposite direction (that is, it specified less aftercare service). Although the study attempted to develop accurate measures of aftercare (see definitions in Appendix D or in Chapter 14 of Report No. 4), the aftercare measures used in this study are of uncertain reliability.

Validation outcomes. Camp-type A was fully validated for lower and all risks, and partially validated for higher risks, as listed below.

- Full Validation: Lower Recidivism Rates with All Risks Combined.
- Full Validation: Lower Recidivism Rates with Lower Risk Youths.
- Partial Validation: Lower Recidivism Rates with Higher Risk Youths.

Table 6 shows that the 11 Type A camps had significantly lower recidivism rates in both the 1982 and 1984 samples for lower risks and for all youths combined. (The 11 Type A camps are listed in Appendix F.) In addition, the results suggest a tendency for this camp-type to have lower recidivism rates with higher risk youths. More complete data on recidivism and state commitment rates achieved by high and low scoring camps with each risk level are shown in Appendix G-1, separately for the 1982, 1984, and 1984-revised samples.

TABLE 6  
Validation Data for Non-LA Camp-Type A

RECIDIVISM RATES FOR ALL RISKS COMBINED			
	1982	1984	1984 Rev.
High-score Camps	54.3	54.8	52.4
Low-score Camps	71.7	61.7	63.9
Difference	17.4	6.9	11.5
RECIDIVISM RATES FOR LOWER RISKS			
	1982	1984	1984 Rev.
High-score Camps	25.3	18.6	18.9
Low-score Camps	33.0	34.1	37.0
Difference	25.3	18.6	18.9
RECIDIVISM RATES FOR HIGHER RISKS			
	1982	1984	1984 Rev.
High-score Camps	61.5	66.0	63.4
Low-score Camps	83.2	71.0	76.9
Difference	21.7	5.0*	13.5

\*All differences are statistically significant, except this one.

Rates are for 24-months follow-up.

Results shown in Table 6 for the 1984-revised sample indicate that camps scoring high on Type A typically had recidivism rates 11.5 percentage-points less for all risks combined than camps scoring low. Additionally, the differences for lower risks were 18.9 points and for higher risks, 13.5 points.

### **Non-LA Camp-Type B**

Camp-type B was derived from a regression analysis on recidivism for higher risk youths in the 1982 sample. A regression using the 1984 sample failed to identify a set of camp variables jointly related to recidivism among higher risks. Nevertheless, this camp-type was retained because of the strong relationship between the 1982-derived camp-type and lower recidivism for higher risks in both the 1982 and 1984 samples.

**Characteristics of Non-LA Camp-type B.** Salient program features of Camp-type B are Vocational Training and Religious Activities. Table 7 lists individual characteristics of camps classified as Type B. Vocational training is a strong component of these camps, as indicated by its heavy weighting in the scale. These medium- to small-sized camps tend to have less frequent formal counseling (average of 1.2 or fewer weekly contacts), and above-average hours of religious activities. Camp characteristics are defined in Appendix D.

### **Validation outcomes.**

- Full Validation: Lower Recidivism Rates with Higher Risk Youths.
- Partial Validation: Lower Recidivism Rates with All Risks Combined.

The 11 camps (listed in Appendix F) that scored high on Camp-type B had recidivism rates that were 19.5 points less for higher risk youths, as shown in Table 8. In fact, recidivism and commitment rates for higher risks were nearly the same as those shown for medium risks. See Appendix G-2, which contains figures for high and low scoring camps on recidivism as well as commitment rates for each risk level.

TABLE 7

## Camps Achieving Positive Outcomes: Non-LA Type B

Features	Type, Amount, Direction	Weight
<u>GENERAL FEATURES</u>		
Camp Capacity	smaller - 50 beds or less	6.1
<u>PROGRAM FEATURES</u>		
Vocational training	higher freq.: 4.3 avg.	17.5
Religious activities	more hours: 2.5 avg.	7.1
Counseling services	lower freq.: 1.2 avg.	4.7
Work activities	more hours: 15.9 avg.	3.6
<u>STAFF</u>		
Ratio: Youths-to-total-staff	higher ratio: 1 to 1 or more	0.2

TABLE 8

## Validation Data for Non-LA Camp-Type B

RECIDIVISM RATES FOR HIGHER RISKS			
	1982	1984	1984 Rev.
High-score Camps	63.5	57.2	56.3
Low-score Camps	83.1	74.4	75.8
Difference	19.6	17.2	19.5
RECIDIVISM RATES FOR ALL RISKS COMBINED			
	1982	1984	1984 Rev.
High-score Camps	60.0	53.1	55.4
Low-score Camps	68.3	61.3	58.6
Difference	8.3	8.2	3.2*

\*All differences are statistically significant, except this one.

Rates are for 24-months follow-up.

### Non-LA Camp-Type C

Camp-type C was derived from a regression analysis on commitments for higher risks. This is a composite type in that it contains a mixture of variables identified in regressions run separately on the 1982 and 1984 samples.

Characteristics of Non-LA Camp-type C. Salient program features of Camp-type C are Physical and Religious Activities in Small, Individualized Settings. Table 9 lists individual characteristics of camps classified as Type C. General features include larger living units, but lower overall camp capacity. The program is characterized by a higher-than-average frequency of recreation and religious activities, and an average of 20.9 hours devoted to offgrounds activities each week. The program contains lower-than-average components of academic training and work activities. Counseling usually occurs once per week. Youths are assigned to programs on an individual case basis and the ratio of youths to treatment staff is lower than average: less than 1.5 youths per individual staff.

#### Validation outcomes.

- Full Validation: Lower Commitment Rates for Higher Risks.
- Full Validation: Lower Commitment Rates for All Risks Combined.
- Partial Validation: Lower Commitment Rates for Lower Risks.

The ten highest scoring camps (listed in Appendix F) had significantly lower state commitment rates for higher risks and for all risks combined. These findings are displayed in Table 10. With the 1984-revised sample, camps scoring high on Type C had commitment rates that were 9.8 points less for all risks and less by 25.9 points for higher risk youths. The complete array of recidivism and commitment rates for high and low scoring camps is listed in Appendix G-3 for each risk level.

TABLE 9

## Camps Achieving Positive Outcomes: Non-LA Type C

Features	Type, Amount, Direction	Weight
<u>GENERAL FEATURES</u>		
Total capacity used	higher: over 80%	14.2
Living unit capacity	larger: 32 beds or more	11.9
Camp capacity	smaller: 50 beds or less	11.4
<u>PROGRAM FEATURES</u>		
Recreation	higher freq.: 9.3 avg.	15.7
Recreation	fewer hours: 9.2 avg.	3.7
Offgrounds activities	more hours: 20.9 avg.	6.5
Religious activities	higher freq.: 1.6 avg.	6.1
Academic training	fewer hours: 11.9 avg.	10.2
Work activities	fewer hours: 6.1 avg.	6.4
Counseling	lower freq.: 1.2 avg.	5.1
<u>CASE PROCESSING</u>		
Program assignment	individual	14.0
<u>STAFF</u>		
Ratio: Youths-to-treatment-staff	lower: less than 1.5 to 1	7.6

TABLE 10

## Validation Data for Non-LA Camp-Type C

COMMITMENT RATES FOR ALL RISKS COMBINED			
	1982	1984	1984 Rev.
High-score Camps	18.2	13.3	12.6
Low-score Camps	25.2	22.6	22.4
Difference	7.0	9.3	9.8
COMMITMENT RATES FOR HIGHER RISKS			
	1982	1984	1984 Rev.
High-score Camps	23.1	22.5	18.7
Low-score Camps	47.2	39.2	44.6
Difference	24.1	16.7	25.9
COMMITMENT RATES FOR LOWER RISKS			
	1982	1984	1984 Rev.
High-score Camps	12.8	6.1	1.6
Low-score Camps	23.7	13.6	10.6
Difference	10.9	7.5*	9.0

\*All differences are statistically significant, except this one.

Rates are for 24-months follow-up.

### Non-LA Camp-Type D

Camp-type D evolved from a factor analysis of 32 measures of camp characteristics. Eleven of these items comprised a primary factor describing a major group of camps. Further statistical analyses determined that camps that had many of these characteristics had more positive outcomes than camps without as many of the same characteristics.

**Characteristics of Non-LA Camp-Type D.** Salient program features of Camp-type D are Academic Training, Physical Activities, and Community Ties. The variables comprising Camp-type D are shown in Table 11. This camp-type is represented by small, single-unit camps in rural settings, with longer-than-average lengths of stay in the program. The program emphasizes academic training, but much programming tends to be related to outside contacts and offgrounds activities. These camps have an above average number of volunteer service hours and an

objective method of measuring progress through the program (stages method). Finally, these camps have a lower-than-average ratio of youths to total staff: one or less youths per staff member.

TABLE 11  
Camps Achieving Positive Outcomes:  
Non-LA Type D

Features	Type, Amount, Direction	Weight
<u>GENERAL FEATURES</u>		
Length of stay	longer: 213 or more days	6.9
Setting	rural	6.5
Camp capacity	smaller: 50 beds or less	4.9
No. of living units	single unit	3.7
<u>PROGRAM FEATURES</u>		
Offgrounds activities	higher freq.: 1.5 avg.	6.7
Academic training	higher freq.: 5.0 avg.	6.0
Outside contacts	higher freq.: 2.3 avg.	4.0
Outside contacts	more hours: 7.8 avg.	4.8
<u>STAFF AND CASE PROCESSING</u>		
Volunteer services	more hours: 6 or more	7.0
Progress through program	stages system	4.4
Ratio: Youths-to-total-staff	lower ratio: less than 1-to-1	4.0

**Validation outcomes.**

- Full Validation: Lower Recidivism Rates with Lower Risks.
- Partial Validation: Lower Commitment Rates with Higher Risks.

Validated findings are shown in Table 11 above. Recidivism and commitment rates for high and low scoring camps are presented in Appendix G-4, by risk level.

Table 12 shows that, with the 1984-revised sample, high-score camps had a recidivism rate that averaged 16.2 points less than low-score camps, in the case of lower risk youths. In addition,

high-score camps had commitment rates for higher risk youths that were over 20 points less than for low-score camps with the 1982 and 1984 samples.

**Results by Risk Level Across Camp-Types**

**Higher-risk youth.** The average difference in recidivism for youths released in 1984 from the two types of camps that were more successful with these higher-risk youths than were other camps was 16.5 percentage points at 24-months post-camp follow-up. (This equaled a 21.7% reduction in recidivism.) That is, the average recidivism rate for higher-risk youths released from these camps in 1984 was 16.5 percentage points lower than that of 1984 releases from camps which did not have the first camps' combination of features or which had them to a lesser degree. For higher-risk releases in the 1982 sample, the difference in recidivism rates between those camps was 20.7 percentage points (a 24.9% difference).

TABLE 12

Validation Data for Non-LA Camp-Type D

RECIDIVISM RATES FOR LOWER RISKS			
	1982	1984	1984 Rev.
High-score Camps	30.2	31.1	34.4
Low-score Camps	51.1	48.0	50.6
Difference	20.9	16.9	16.2
COMMITMENT RATES FOR HIGHER RISKS			
	1982	1984	1984 Rev.
High-score Camps	12.2	17.7	27.9
Low-score Camps	36.7	38.0	32.5
Difference	24.5	20.3	4.6*

\*All differences are statistically significant, except this one.

Rates are for 24-months follow-up.

**Lower-risk youth.** The average recidivism difference within the types of 1984 camps that were more successful with these youths than were other 1984 camps was 17.6 percentage points at 24-months post-camp follow-up (this equaled a 32.9% difference in recidivism). For lower-recidivism-risk youths who were released in 1982, the average recidivism difference was 23.1 percentage points (a 42.4% difference).

**Medium-risk youth.** No significant differences were found in any camp-types for medium-risk youth.



## VI. UTILIZING INFORMATION ON CAMP-TYPES

### Selecting a Camp-Type

This section is included for administrators, practitioners, policy makers, and others who might wish to utilize the information on camp-types. There are several approaches to the use of this information in modifying existing programs, or in developing programs for planned juvenile facilities. As a first step, a determination should be made of the percentage of youths at each risk level in the target population. See Appendix B for the recidivism risk scale. Table 13 shows the distribution of risk levels in the "typical" camp population in counties other than Los Angeles. A range of percentages is given for each risk level.

Establishing specific goals is important in the selection and adaptation of any camp-type. For instance, one goal might be to achieve an overall reduction in recidivism by adopting some or all features of a camp-type that had reduced recidivism for all risk levels combined. Another approach might be to reduce the state commitment rate among a specific risk level.

TABLE 13

Percentage of Each Recidivism Risk Level in Typical Camp Population  
in Counties Other Than Los Angeles

<u>Risk Level</u>	<u>Range of Percentages</u>
Lower	24% to 28%
Medium	53% to 55%
Higher	20% to 21%

---

Note. How this table is used in the selection of an appropriate camp-type is explained in the following section and in Appendix G. Generally, if a camp's population contains a percentage of a risk group larger than shown in the table, the camp-types selected for adaptation should be one identified as being more successful with that risk level.

**Approach 1.** If the target population contains percentages of lower, medium, and higher risks within or near the percentage ranges shown in Table 13, select and emphasize the characteristics of camp-types associated with better outcomes for all risks combined.

**Approach 2.** If the target population contains a substantially higher percentage of one particular risk level—say, higher risks—than shown in Table 13, planners should focus on those camp-types that worked best with that specific risk level.

**Approach 3.** If the target population falls somewhere between those described in approaches 1 and 2, it may be best to develop separate or individualized programs for youths grouped by whichever risk level is dominant in the camp's population.<sup>4</sup> Planners might, for instance, develop one program component based on a camp-type shown to have resulted in a lower state commitment rate for higher risk youths, and a separate component based on a camp-type shown to have resulted in reduced recidivism among lower risks.

However, users are cautioned against combining elements from two camp-types. These elements, in their new combination, may produce results somewhat different from those with which they were associated in their original mixture, or even by themselves. Moreover, a set of features that lead to lower recidivism for one risk level may have no positive effect on (and may even negatively affect) another risk level. In addition, camp-types associated with lower recidivism are not necessarily associated with lower state commitments.

**Adopting camp features.** In adopting the features of a specific camp-type, the "variable weights" associated with those features should be considered. The higher the weight, the stronger the association between the feature and positive outcomes.

---

<sup>4</sup>The "dominant" risk level, or that level with the highest percentage in the population, will normally be the medium risk level. None of the four camp-types showed significantly better outcomes for medium risks. However, an inspection of the outcomes of all camp-types shows that when better outcomes were found for either lower or higher risks, there was often some effects with medium risks (i.e., medium risks also showed lower recidivism or state commitment rates, even though the differences were not large enough for statistical significance). Planners might classify the youth population into two groups--higher vs. lower risks--and, based on that information, adopt an "optimal" camp-type.

Some features—mainly physical and structural conditions such as camp setting or capacity—are in effect unchangeable or only minimally changeable. If the camp-type selected for adaptation contains such features, and if the target camp presently lacks these features, policy makers might compensate for this situation by adding or increasing—or, if appropriate, by eliminating or decreasing—other features that are part of the relevant camp-type. In doing so, the target camp might well invest its efforts in adapting or modifying those features with higher weights. There is, of course, no guarantee that the new combination or pattern of features will work as effectively as the original camp-type, since each variable operates in interaction with the other variables in the set to produce the better outcome. The adoption of a single feature from the list may have little or no positive effect, unless other necessary features are also present.

Appendix H contains an example of how program features may be modified to resemble those of a camp-type.

**Guide to camp-type selection.** Table 14 contains a "directory" of camp-types. It shows, for each risk level, the types that were associated with or helped produce lower recidivism or state commitment rates. Once it is decided which risk level(s) planners wish to impact in the target camp, this directory can facilitate the identification of the relevant camp-type or types.

TABLE 14  
Camp-Types With Better Post-Camp Outcomes,  
by Youth Risk Level

Camp-Type	Lower Recidivism			Lower State Commitments		
	All	<u>Risk Level</u> Lower	Higher	All	<u>Risk Level</u> Lower	Higher
A	Yes	Yes	Yes*			
B	Yes*		Yes			
C				Yes	Yes*	Yes
D		Yes				Yes*



## VII. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

### Discussion

Part I of this validation study has provided information on the performance of juvenile probation camps in counties other than Los Angeles in terms of rates of recidivism and state commitment. The study also identified and validated four camp-types, some of which have been shown to have lower recidivism rates and some with lower state commitment rates, compared to other camps.

The culmination of knowledge gained in this study may be in the identification and specification of camp-types that produce lower recidivism and state commitment rates than camps in general.

The report attempts to inform policy makers and practitioners on how to use this information to modify existing programs or develop new ones. Due to limitations in the size of this report, it was not possible to provide the full scope of the available data. The seriously interested reader is referred to Report No. 4, especially those sections which detail the camp characteristics. For probation administrators wishing to use this information in an effort to enhance their programs, technical assistance may be requested from the Research Division of the Youth Authority.

### Implications

Juvenile probation camps are one element of a local probation system designed to provide public protection. The system can also be said to provide incapacitation, punishment, and "rehabilitation and treatment" of adjudicated youth. In Phase I of the Juvenile Probation Camps Validation Study, public protection was evidenced by the sheer numbers of youthful offenders incarcerated for an average of 5.6 months in camps operated by counties other than Los Angeles. Such protection was further indicated by the reduction of violent offending following camp release. Additionally, non-recidivism was also equated with protection of the public. Of a group of youths released from camps in these counties during 1982, 35.3% had no further sustained

petitions or convictions within a 24-month period. This rate increased to 42.5% with 1984 camp releases.

Of youths released from these camps in 1982, 20% were committed to state institutions. The rate of state commitments was 16% among releases in 1984; and it is speculated that without a local camp system, even greater numbers of youths would be committed to state institutions. While available data do not allow an exact determination of the number of additional commitments, projected additional commitments can be extrapolated. The 1984 non-LA cohort had the following outcomes:

- 100.0% - Represented by the total 1984 satisfactory camp releases
- 42.5% - Nonrecidivists successfully retained in community (for at least two years)
- 57.5% - Recidivists of whom:
  - 16.0% were committed to the state
  - 41.5% were not committed, but alternatively were handled in the community by probation continuance or return to camp

These percentages can be used to make the following rough projections. Approximately 2,920 youths are satisfactorily released from non-LA camps each year. Of those, 57.5% or 1,680 will recidivate and of those recidivists, 270 will receive commitments to state institutions. Of the 1,410 recidivists (1,680 minus 270) currently being handled at the local level (such as by probation continuance, hall commitment, or return to camp), it seems probable that, in the absence of county camps, some unknown and indeterminable number of youths would be considered eligible for commitment to the state. It seems especially likely that many camp releases who committed serious offenses such as robbery, assault, burglary, major drug usage or sales, etc., would be sentenced to state institutions.

The study achieved its goal of identifying some camp programs that maintained lower recidivism rates than others, and they did so with both the 1982 and 1984 samples. This, in itself, tends to lend support to the viability of probation camps. Furthermore, it indicates that improvements can be made in the performance of camps in terms of lower recidivism and state commitment rates. For instance, it was found that some camps had recidivism rates over 75%,

while others showed rates of 40% or lower. One implication of this study is that if camps with higher rates were to adopt some of these characteristics of camp programs with lower rates, those camps might be able to achieve similar or, at least, lower rates.



## REFERENCES

- Palmer, T. & Wedge, R. (1989). California's juvenile probation camps: A synopsis. Sacramento: California Department of the Youth Authority.
- Palmer, T. & Wedge, R. (1989). California's juvenile probation camps: Summary. Sacramento: California Department of the Youth Authority.
- Palmer, T. & Wedge, R. (1994). California's juvenile probation camps: A validation study. Executive Summary. Sacramento: California Department of the Youth Authority.
- Wedge, R., & Palmer, T. (1989). California's juvenile probation camps: A technical analysis of outcomes for a 1982 release cohort. Camps, Ranches, and Schools Study—Report No. 4. Sacramento: California Youth Authority.
- Wedge, R., & Palmer, T. (1994). California's juvenile probation camps: A validation study. Part II: Los Angeles County camps. Sacramento: California Youth Authority.



## APPENDIX A

### RESEARCH METHODS

The validation analysis consisted of three major aspects. The first was a comparison of the characteristics of the 1982 and 1984 camp samples. The second involved a comparison of the recidivism and commitment rates observed for the two samples. The third area of analysis dealt with determining whether the sets of camps variables that were related to better probation outcomes for the 1982 sample were also significantly and positively related for the 1984 sample.

#### Sample Selection

Because several thousand youths are admitted each year to camps in counties other than Los Angeles, it would have been both impractical and unnecessary to include all of them in the analysis. Therefore, the populations were sampled in a stratified random manner.

1982 sample. The 1982 sample included all youths released or otherwise removed from 36 camps in counties other than Los Angeles during four different months in 1982. The months, more or less arbitrarily designated, were February, April, June, and September. After some cases were dropped because their records were sealed by the court, lost, or otherwise unidentifiable, the sample size was 1,589 males.

Although basic characteristic and outcome data were presented for females in the initial camp study report, females were excluded from the validation analysis because of their relatively small number and because the findings would be more generalizable if limited to males. Thus, two female camps and two predominantly female coed camps were omitted, reducing the number of camps in the analysis to 32.

1984 sample. One goal of the earlier study was to describe the characteristics of youths in camps. To achieve this, data were collected on all male youths residing in camps on a "census" day (July 20, 1984) resulting in a sample of 1,780.

In developing the present study plan, it was decided to use the 1984 sample for validation analyses and to compare it with the original 1982 sample. However, it was not necessary to use the entire 1984 sample. In fact, a decision was made to limit the 1984 sample to a number smaller than that of the 1982 sample in order to reduce the amount of follow-up data collection that counties would be asked to provide.

Thus, a somewhat smaller sample was randomly chosen from the 1,575 males in the same 32 camps. An attempt was made to match the proportion of youths from each camp in the 1984 sample with the same proportion it represented in the total 1982 sample. Cases were chosen based on their day of birth. For example, if 66% of a camp's 1984 population was needed to match that camp's proportion in the 1982 sample, then those youths with birthdays ranging from the 1st to the 20th of any given month were chosen (20 out of 30 days in a month, or 66%). The resulting sample size was 1,271.

The two samples differ as follows. The 1982 sample can be described as a release cohort. The basis for a youth's inclusion was that he was released during one of the four months in 1982. The 1984 sample might be described as a resident cohort, in that youths were included if they resided in camp at a specified time (July 20, 1984). Most youths in the 1984 sample were released during 1984, and a few were released in 1985.

**Type of camp release.** Sample size was also affected by type of release from camp. Youths were either released after satisfactory program completion or they were removed because of disciplinary problems or escape. Satisfactory releases may have included some short-term escapes who were returned to camp to complete the program. The unsatisfactory removals were dropped from the samples for this analysis. At any rate, the specification of which youths were unsatisfactory removals may be at question. This is discussed in a following section on data limitations. The analysis was based on satisfactory releases in order to better assess the impact of camps on the behavior of youths following exposure to completed camp programs.

**Final sample size.** After dropping the unsatisfactory removals, the 1982 sample contained 1,206 satisfactory releases. The 1984 sample was slightly smaller, at 1,095 cases.

### Data Limitations

There were certain limitations in the data used for this study. However, it was not possible to determine if these limitations had any effect on the outcomes or findings of this study.

For the follow-up of the 1984 sample, the Research Division provided each county with a list of youths earlier identified by the county as being in camp on July 20, 1984. When developing follow-up data, several counties reported their records indicated that a total of 88 youths on the YA lists had not actually been in camp in July 1984. No explanation was provided as to how these individuals appeared on the original lists. One possibility is that they had either escaped or been unsatisfactorily removed from camp in 1984 but their names had temporarily remained on camp rosters. If true, this would explain the substantial difference in the percentage of satisfactory releases between the 1982 and 1984 samples. In 1982, 75.9% of the males were satisfactorily released, compared to 86.2% in 1984. If the 88 youths in question were in fact unsatisfactorily removed, the program completion rate for 1984 becomes 80.6%, a figure more in line with that for 1982. At any rate, because of these possible differences, it was decided to not use rate of satisfactory program completion as a measure of positive outcome. On the other hand, this circumstance has no apparent relationship to or effect on the recidivism rates shown for the two samples.

All follow-up data were provided by individual county probation departments. There were some differences in data collection procedures for the 1982 and 1984 follow-up.

For the follow-up of 1982 releases from camps, probation departments provided a record of all petitions sustained for juveniles. For those youths who turned 18 during the 24-month follow-up period, rap sheets (adult criminal records) were requested from the State Bureau of Criminal Statistics. All youths were released in 1982; therefore, for the latest release in the group, the 24-month follow-up period extended through December 1984.

Probation departments also provided a record of sustained petitions for each juvenile in the 1984 sample. However, in this follow-up, criminal records for the entire sample were requested through CLETS—California Law Enforcement Tracking System. Youths who were in camp in

July 1984 were released beginning in July 1984 and, in a few cases, well into 1985. For some, the 24-month follow-up period may have therefore extended into late 1987.

If any difference exists due to data collection methods, it might be that criminal history information is more complete for the 1984 sample because adult records were requested for all youths and not just for those over 18, and because of possible improvements in information technology from 1985 to 1988, such as the use of CLETS rather than BCS rap sheets.

### **Risk of Recidivism and Other Statistical Adjustments**

Recidivism rates are greatly affected by the characteristics of the youths being studied; that is, some youths are more likely to recidivate than others. In the earlier camp study, an analysis was made of the relationship between youth characteristics and subsequent recidivism. Among the available measurements or characteristics, those found to be most predictive of recidivism were: (1) number of prior sustained petitions, (2) age at first sustained petition, and (3) prior institutional commitments of 30 days or more. These three variables were weighted and combined into a single risk of recidivism scale with eight points: scores of 1 or 2 were rated lower risk, 3 to 6 were medium risk, and 7 or 8 were deemed higher risk. The higher the score, the higher the risk of recidivism.

In all validation analyses, outcome measures for groups of youths being compared were statistically adjusted for differences in risk scores and certain other pertinent variables: age at release from camp and whether youth had resided in a secure or nonsecure camp. Such adjustments were accomplished, to the extent possible, through the statistical method of analysis of covariance, which helped control for differences between group characteristics—in this case, those associated with risk of recidivism. This scale is predictive of the likelihood of recidivism, not seriousness of offense. In other words, violent offenders (e.g., robbers, assaulters) are not necessarily those with high risk of recidivism on this scale. See Appendix B for instructions on how to score risk of recidivism.

## Outcome Measures

The validation analysis centers on three outcome measures of most interest to practitioners, policy makers, and others:

1. Recidivism rate during a 24-month period following camp release.
2. State commitment rate during the same follow-up period.
3. Violent offending rate—in particular the number of violent offenses/offenders prior to camp admission and following camp release.

Recidivism is defined as a sustained Welfare & Institutions Code Section 602 petition for a juvenile or, for those who turned age 18 during the follow-up, a conviction in adult court. State commitment is a court sentence to the Youth Authority or the Department of Corrections. Recidivism and commitment rates were measured within a period of 24 months following release from camp. This period, which extends beyond usual county probation aftercare services, was used in order to identify and examine possible longer-term effects. In addition, the camp-types described in the initial report were identified using 24-month outcomes.



## APPENDIX B

### RECIDIVISM RISK SCALE

For the purposes of comparing outcome between camps and assessing the utility of camp-types, it was necessary to develop a method of distinguishing among types of youths. A scale was developed to project each youth's risk of recidivism.

After examining all available youth characteristics, three were selected that best predicted subsequent recidivism.<sup>1</sup> These were (1) age at first sustained petition, (2) prior institutional commitments of 30 days or more, and (3) number of prior sustained petitions. The items were given weights and, collectively, provided a scale from 1 to 8, which was indexed to lower, medium, and higher risk levels.

#### HOW TO SCORE YOUTHS ON THE RECIDIVISM RISK SCALE

Score the youth on each of the three characteristics, as follows:

<u>Youth Characteristic</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>Weight</u>	<u>Youth's Score</u>
Age at First Sustained Petition	13 or under	3	_____
	14 or 15	1	_____
	16 or over	0	_____
Prior Institutional Commitments	1 or more	2	_____
	None	1	_____
No. of Prior Sustained Petitions	2 or more	3	_____
	1	1	_____
	None	0	_____
Total Risk Score			_____

<u>RISK SCORE</u>	<u>RECIDIVISM RISK GROUP</u>
1 - 2	Lower
3 - 6	Medium
7 - 8	Higher

<sup>1</sup>See Probation Camps Study Report No. 4 for a more complete description of the development of the recidivism risk scale. (See references.)



APPENDIX C

POST-CAMP OUTCOMES FOR 1982 AND 1984 CAMP SAMPLES  
IN COUNTIES OTHER THAN LOS ANGELES

TABLE C-1

Recidivism and State Commitment Rates at Four Follow-up Periods,  
By Type of Release From Camp  
1982 and 1984 Samples

Type of Camp Release	Sample	N	Follow-up Period and Recidivism Rate				Commitment Rate <sup>a</sup>
			6 Mos.	12 Mos.	18 Mos.	24 Mos.	
Satisfactory	1982	1,206	35.2*	52.0*	60.3*	64.7*	20.0*
	1984	1,095	36.2	42.4	52.7	57.5	16.0
Unsatisfactory	1982	383	72.6*	81.2*	85.4*	88.0*	43.6
	1984	176	47.2	63.1	72.7	80.1	38.1
Total Releases	1982	1,589	44.2*	59.0*	66.3*	70.3*	25.7*
	1984	1,271	29.1	45.2	55.5	60.7	19.0

\*Difference between 1982 and 1984 rates is statistically significant.

<sup>a</sup>24-month follow-up.

TABLE C-2

Recidivism and State Commitment Rates at Four Follow-up Periods,  
By Youth's Risk of Recidivism Level  
1982 and 1984 Satisfactory Releases

Risk of Recidivism	Sample	N	Follow-up Period and Recidivism Rate				Commitment Rate <sup>a</sup>
			6 Mos.	12 Mos.	18 Mos.	24 Mos.	
Lower Risk	1982	293	25.9	39.9	45.7	50.5	12.6*
	1984	303	20.1	32.7	42.2	46.9	7.3
Medium Risk	1982	664	35.1*	52.4*	61.4*	65.8*	18.8
	1984	576	25.5	42.9	54.0	59.6	17.0
Higher Risk	1982	249	46.2*	65.1*	74.3*	78.3*	31.7
	1984	216	36.6	54.6	63.9	67.1	25.5

\*Difference between 1982 and 1984 rates is statistically significant.

<sup>a</sup>24-month follow-up.



## APPENDIX D

### DEFINITIONS OF CAMP CHARACTERISTICS

This appendix defines the characteristics used to define camp-types. Data describing camps in terms of these characteristics were supplied by each camp's staff in the 1984 questionnaire. More extensive definitions and descriptions of camp characteristics may be found in Probation Camps Study Report No. 4.

The averages and amounts associated with camp characteristics are based on data for statewide camps. This was done to maintain commonality of measurement between Los Angeles County camps and camps in all remaining counties. It was preferable that the standard for measurement be the same. For instance, longer length of stay is defined the same in Los Angeles County camps and in those from all other counties—213 or more days.

#### **General Features**

**Camp Capacity.** Maximum-rated capacity (number of available beds). Smaller camps were those with 50 beds or less; medium-sized camps had 51 to 99 beds; larger camps had 100 or more beds.

**Total Capacity Used.** Percentage of capacity or bed occupancy rate. This measure of population density had three levels: lower - 80% or less bed occupancy rate; medium - 81 to 94%; higher - 95% or more.

**Number of Living Units.** A camp had either a single unit or two or more.

**Living Unit Capacity.** Individual living units were rated as either smaller - up to 32 beds, or larger - over 32 beds per unit.

**Living Unit Arrangement.** Camps were categorized as to whether most youths lived in "dorms" or "rooms" (rooms were sometimes occupied by more than one youth).

**Length of Stay.** LOS in the program was either shorter - up to 121 days, medium - 122 to 212 days, or longer - 213 or more days. Average LOS for the 1984 sample was 171 days.

**Physical Setting.** Locations of camps were identified as either "rural" or "non-rural" (the latter were either in urban or suburban areas).

### **Program Features**

Each of the eight following program features was measured in (1) hours per youth per week and (2) frequency or number of occurrences per week. Appendix Table D contains the average number of hours that represent the "more" and "fewer" designations for program features. Also shown are the average figures for "higher" and "lower" frequencies. "More" and "higher" mean "above statewide average." "Fewer" and "lower" mean "below statewide average."

Table D contains the average number of hours that represent the "more" and "fewer" designations for program features, such as counseling and academic training. Table D also contains the average participation per youth per week for "higher" and "lower" frequencies.

### **Counseling**

**Hours.** Camps that provided "more" hours of counseling had an average of 8.2 hours per youth per week and those with "fewer" hours had 1.6 hours. The range of hours was 3 to 14 per youth per week. (Shown in Table D.)

**Frequency.** "Higher" frequency meant an average of 4.0 activities (contacts, occurrences) per week, with a range from 1 to 7. Lower frequency meant an average of 1.2 activities per week. (Shown in Table D.)

### **Vocational Training**

**Hours.** More hours meant an average of 12.8 per youth per week, and ranged from 5 to 21. Fewer hours meant an average of 0.6. Several camps had no vocational training.

**Frequency.** "More frequent" vocational training occurred about 4 times weekly (4.3 avg.). Since some camps had no vocational program, the average lower frequency was less than once (0.3) per week.

APPENDIX TABLE D

Program Activities: Hours and Frequency of Participation Per Youth Per Week—  
Measures of More vs. Fewer Hours and Higher vs. Lower Frequency

Amount of Activity	Type of Activity							
	Coun- seling	Voca- tional	Work Activity	Aca- demic	Reli- gious	Recrea- tion	Off Grounds	Outside Contact
<u>More Hours</u>								
Average	8.2	12.8	15.9	24.8	2.5	19.7	20.9	7.8
Std. Dev.	5.5	8.2	5.1	4.2	0.7	4.2	0.7	10.1
<u>Fewer Hours</u>								
Average	1.6	0.6	6.1	11.9	1.4	9.2	2.5	1.5
Std. Dev.	0.4	2.2	3.1	5.7	0.6	4.5	3.2	0.9
<u>Higher Freq.</u>								
Average	4.0	4.3	7.2	5.0	1.6	9.3	1.5	2.3
Std. Dev.	2.9	1.1	3.7	0.0	0.5	4.0	0.8	1.4
<u>Lower Freq.</u>								
Average	1.2	0.3	3.0	3.4	1.2	5.3	0.5	0.8
Std. Dev.	0.2	0.9	1.2	0.8	0.3	1.1	0.5	0.6

Note. A range for any activity may be calculated by taking the average plus and minus the standard deviation. In the case of "more hours of counseling," low end of range is approximately 3 ( $8.2 - 5.5 = 2.7$ ) and top end is about 14 ( $8.2 + 5.5 = 13.7$ ).

**Work Activities**

**Hours.** Camps with more hours had an average of 15.9 hours per ward per week (range 11 to 21). The average was 6.1 for camps that provided fewer hours (range 3 to 9).

**Frequency.** Higher frequency was 7.2 times per week (range 4 to 11); lower frequency was 3.0 (range 2 to 4).

**Academic Training**

**Hours.** More hours - 24.8 avg. (range, 21 to 29);

Fewer hours - 11.9 avg. (range, 6 to 18).

**Frequency.** Higher - 5.0 (5 times a week, i.e., no range);  
Lower - 3.4 (range, 3 or 4 times a week).

### **Religious Activities**

**Hours.** More hours - 2.5 (range, 2 to 3);  
Fewer hours - 1.4 (range, 1 to 2).

**Frequency.** Higher - 1.6 (range, 1 to 2);  
Lower - 1.2 (about once a week).

### **Recreation**

**Hours.** More hours - 19.7 (range, 15 to 24);  
Fewer hours - 9.2 (range, 5 to 14).

**Frequency.** Higher - 9.3 (once or twice a week);  
Lower - 5.3 (less than once a week).

### **Offgrounds Activities**

**Hours.** More hours - 20.9 (range, 18 to 33);  
Fewer hours - 2.5 (range, 0 to 6).

**Frequency.** Higher - 1.5 (once or twice a week);  
Lower - 0.5 (less than once a week).

### **Outside Contacts**

**Hours.** More hours - 7.8 (range, 2 to 18);  
Fewer hours - 1.5 (range, 1 to 2).

**Frequency.** Higher - 2.3 (range, 1 to 4);  
Lower - 0.8 (about once a week).

## **Staff and Case Processing Variables**

**Youth-to-Total Staff Ratio.** A ratio based on the number of youth (in the average daily population) per staff member. Total staff is all-inclusive: treatment, service, administrative, etc.

**Youth-to-Treatment Staff Ratio.** A ratio of youths to staff in direct contact with youths: counselors, deputy probation officers, teachers, psychologists, etc.

**Volunteer Services.** An estimate of the number of service hours provided by volunteers each month. More volunteer services was 6.0 hours or more per youth per month. Less service was 5.9 or fewer hours per youth.

**Program Assignment.** New admissions were either placed in the camp's single program (uniform assignment) or placed in a program according to more specific needs (individual assignment).

**Case Reviews.** This variable described whether youths were or were not present at their case reviews.

**Progress-Through-Program.** The variety of systems was, for this report, dichotomized into two categories. "Stages" refers to measuring a youth's progress in stages, levels, steps, phases, etc. "Other" methods might include any but the above, such as using ranks or merit lists, or evaluating with grades or points.

## **Aftercare Services**

**Post-Camp Supervision.** This was a measure of a number of aftercare services, such as school or work placement, living arrangements, counseling in drug abuse or other problem areas, referral services, accountability for fines or restitution, and intensive supervision on reduced caseloads. Each camp was scored yes or no on each item; the "yeses" were summed; a camp with more than an average score was said to be rated higher on this variable.

**Camp Plus Post-Camp Supervision.** This measure equalled the score on Post-Camp Supervision, plus its score on two additional items: (1) continuity of effort/involvement (the deputy probation officer interacted with the youth prior to his release), and (2) focus on camp releases (an aftercare caseload comprised of at least 90% camp releases).

**Pct. Camp Caseload.** This was the percentage of an aftercare caseload represented by camp releases.

## APPENDIX E

### DEVELOPMENT OF CAMP-TYPES AND VALIDATION METHODS

#### Development of Camp-Types With 1982 Sample

Results of the outcome analysis reported for the 1982 sample indicated that certain camps had better outcomes than others, especially with youths of different risk levels. The task was to look for measurable characteristics shared by these more successful camps. Two statistical approaches were used: stepwise multiple regression and factor analysis.

**Regression analysis.** The youth release cohort provided four samples: lower, medium, and higher risks, and all risks combined. For each of these samples, two regressions were run, one on recidivism and one on state commitment. This resulted in eight separate regression analyses. In the first step, camps were ranked by their recidivism rates with all youths, that is, with youths of all risk levels. The camps were then divided at the midpoint into higher and lower recidivism rate groups. Regression analysis identified which of 32 camp characteristics or variables, in combination, seemed to best predict those camps with lower recidivism rates for all youths combined.

This method of analysis was then repeated for camps that had better recidivism outcomes with lower, medium, and higher risk youths. Finally, the entire analysis was repeated, this time using regression to predict camps that had lower state commitment rates.

Seven of the eight regression analyses resulted in a set of interrelated camp variables that best identified camps with significantly better outcomes for all youths or for one or more risk groups. These sets of camp variables delineated seven camp-types. The sets of variables were then used to develop scoring keys, with each variable given a weight based on its statistical importance within the set of variables.

**Factor analysis.** Principal components analysis was used to group the 32 camp variables into clusters or "factors" of statistically interrelated variables. Factor analysis represents an approach to identifying camp-types different from that of regression analysis. Regression analysis

identified sets of variables that best predicted an outcome criterion—recidivism or commitment rate among a sample of youths. Factor analysis, on the other hand, identified different groups of camp variables (or "factors") that statistically best accounted for existing differences among the camps. In short, the variables were grouped without reference to individual youth outcomes. Instead, they were grouped in sets that best described a type of camp distinct from other types identified in the process. The result was three additional camp-types, for a total of ten camp-types.

In the next step, each camp was scored on each regression- or factor-derived camp-type. Those camps with a score in the top one-third of the range of scores for all camps on a given type were said to have high scores on that type, that is, to have characteristics highly similar to those comprising the type.

In the final step of the initial analysis, recidivism and commitment rates of those camps with high scores (generally, in the top one-third) on each camp-type were compared with rates for camps that had low scores (lower one-third) to determine if the rates achieved by high score camps were significantly better.

### **Validation Methods**

The validation of camp-types involved several replication procedures. The process began with the ten camp-types identified in the 1982 study. Camps with high scores on these 1982-derived camp-type scales had significantly lower recidivism and/or commitment rates for youths of one or more risk levels, compared to camps with low scores on the corresponding scales.

**Step 1.** The first level of validation was designed to determine if camps with high scores on the 1982-derived camp-types also had significantly lower rates for youths of the same risk level in the 1984 sample of camp youths.

**Results:** Covariance analysis confirmed that six of the ten camp-types had significantly better outcomes with the same risk levels in both the 1982 and 1984 samples.

**Step 2.** Seven of the 1982-derived camp-types were comprised of groups of camp characteristics (variables) selected by regression analysis as being related to and predictive of more positive outcomes. (The other three 1982 camp-types were derived by factor analysis.) A second level of validation was designed to determine if a regression analysis using the 1984 sample would identify some or all of the same groups of variables (camp-types) as being predictive of better outcomes.

**Results:** Those variables selected by regression in both analyses were retained as key characteristics of revised, composite camp-type scales. Also retained were variables that, although not selected by regression, were independently and statistically correlated to positive outcomes in both the 1982 and 1984 samples. This process resulted in six "composite" camp-types to be tested at the next level of validation.<sup>1</sup>

**Step 3.** The final level of validation was designed to compare outcomes for camps scoring high on the six composite camp-type scales with outcomes for those camps scoring low. The analysis was based on outcomes with the 1984 sample.

**Results:** Four of the types had significantly better outcomes with the same risk level group as did the original, counterpart camp-types in the 1982 and 1984 analyses.

The above procedures resulted in the statistical validation of four of the camp-types. These camp-types are described in the body of this report. Outcomes for these camp-types are also presented.

---

<sup>1</sup>Only four of the six camp-types were actually composites of 1982 and 1984 regression results. Two camp-types were carried over from the 1982 analysis, as discussed elsewhere in this report.



**APPENDIX F**

**CAMPS WITH HIGHEST SCORES ON EACH OF FOUR VALIDATED CAMP-TYPES  
FOR COUNTIES OTHER THAN LOS ANGELES**

<u>TYPE A</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>TYPE B</u>	<u>Score</u>
Verdemont - San Bernardino	42.5	Camp O'Neal - Mono	34.3
Holden Ranch - Santa Clara	41.1	Placer Juv. Ctr. - Placer	32.1
Meyers - Tulare	39.8	Bar O Boys - Del Norte	32.1
Sonoma YC - Sonoma	39.0	Colston YC - Ventura	31.9
Placer Juv. Ctr. - Placer	38.3	Los Prietos - Santa Barbara	31.9
James Ranch - Santa Clara	36.6	Meyers - Tulare	30.7
Wakefield School - Fresno	36.6	James Ranch Santa Clara	28.4
Sonoma Adol. Ctr. - Sonoma	35.7	Joplin - Orange	28.2
Byron Ranch - Contra Costa	33.8	Glenwood - San Mateo	28.2
Fouts Springs - Solano/Colusa	32.8	Sonoma YC Sonoma	27.2
Joplin - Orange	32.1	Holden Ranch - Santa Clara	26.1
	(Lowest Score = 11.3)		(Lowest Score = 0.2)

<u>TYPE C</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>TYPE D</u>	<u>Score</u>
Van Horn - Riverside	79.8	Sonoma Adol. Ctr. - Sonoma	58.9
Contra Costa Boys - Contra Costa	74.6	Meyers - Tulare	58.9
Rancho del Rayo - San Diego	67.1	Sonoma YC - Sonoma	54.1
Thornton Ctr. - Sacramento	66.8	Placer Juv. Ctr. - Placer	48.2
Meyers - Tulare	65.5	Joplin - Orange	47.1
Camp O'Neal - Mono	63.9	Thornton Ctr. - Sacramento	45.5
Colston YC - Ventura	61.7	Wakefield - Fresno	43.5
Wakefield - Fresno	60.6	Holden Ranch - Santa Clara	43.0
Los Prietos - Santa Barbara	60.4	Sacramento Boys - Sacramento	42.3
Holden Ranch - Santa Clara	59.3	Verdemont - San Bernardino	38.2
	(Lowest Score = 29.8)		(Lowest Score = 3.7)



**APPENDIX G**

**POST-CAMP OUTCOMES BY CAMP-TYPE FOR 1982 AND 1984 SAMPLES  
(COUNTIES OTHER THAN LOS ANGELES)**

TABLE G-1

Post-camp Outcomes for Type A Camps  
With 1982 and 1984 Camp Release Samples

**I. Recidivism at 24-Months Follow-up**

Sample Year	Camp-Type Score	Recidivism Rate, by Risk Level			
		Total	Lower	Medium	Higher
1982	High 1/3	54.3.**	33.0**	58.5*	61.5*
	Low 1/3	71.7	58.3	72.1	83.2
1984	High 1/3	54.8**	34.1**	60.5	66.0
	Low 1/3	61.7	52.7	61.2	71.0
1984 - Rev. Sample	High 1/3	52.4**	37.0**	56.7	63.4*
	Low 1/3	63.9	55.9	63.6	76.9

**II. State Commitment Rate at 24-Months Follow-up**

Sample Year	Camp-Type Score	Commitment Rate, by Risk Level			
		Total	Lower	Medium	Higher
1982	High 1/3	18.0	1.7**	22.6	19.1
	Low 1/3	22.4	20.9	18.7	34.0
1984	High 1/3	13.8	4.7	15.9	20.0
	Low 1/3	18.3	10.7	17.9	28.7
1984 - Rev. Sample	High 1/3	14.8*	5.5	17.8	20.4*
	Low 1/3	19.5	10.9	20.3	32.0

\*Significant difference between adjusted rates of high vs. low score camps for sample/year.

\*\*Significant difference found in all three covariance analyses.

TABLE G-2

Post-camp Outcomes for Type B Camps  
With 1982 and 1984 Camp Release Samples

## I. Recidivism at 24-Months Follow-up

Sample Year	Camp-Type Score	Recidivism Rate, by Risk Level			
		Total	Lower	Medium	Higher
1982	High 1/2	60.0*	43.5	63.7*	63.5**
	Low 1/2	68.3	55.3	67.3	83.1
1984	High 1/2	53.1*	36.8*	58.4	57.2**
	Low 1/2	61.3	49.6	61.6	74.4
1984 - Rev. Sample	High 1/3	55.4**	46.6**	59.7	56.3**
	Low 1/3	58.6	51.0	56.2	75.8

## II. State Commitment Rate at 24-Months Follow-up

Sample Year	Camp-Type Score	Commitment Rate, by Risk Level			
		Total	Lower	Medium	Higher
1982	High 1/2	22.0	11.1	25.0	23.1*
	Low 1/2	21.9	18.1	17.4	36.4
1984	High 1/2	15.0	1.3	18.9	19.8
	Low 1/2	17.3	9.9	15.8	29.6
1984 - Rev. Sample	High 1/3	15.4	6.1	18.8	21.5
	Low 1/3	12.5	3.6	15.4	18.3

\*Significant difference between adjusted rates of high vs. low score camps for sample/year.

\*\*Significant difference found in all three covariance analyses.

TABLE G-3

Post-camp Outcomes for Type C Camps  
With 1982 and 1984 Camp Release Samples

## I. Recidivism at 24-Months Follow-up

Sample Year	Camp-Type Score	Recidivism Rate, by Risk Level			
		Total	Lower	Medium	Higher
1982	High 1/3	62.4*	44.5*	64.9	73.2
	Low 1/3	68.5	58.4	66.6	83.2
1984	High 1/3	59.7	46.9	61.8	69.3
	Low 1/3	60.7	46.5	62.4	73.7
1984 - Rev. Sample	High 1/3	56.1	41.0	60.5	60.5*
	Low 1/3	59.4	44.6	60.4	79.4

## II. State Commitment Rate at 24-Months Follow-up

Sample Year	Camp-Type Score	Commitment Rate, by Risk Level			
		Total	Lower	Medium	Higher
1982	High 1/3	18.2**	12.8*	18.7	23.1**
	Low 1/3	25.2	23.7	17.6	47.2
1984	High 1/3	13.3**	6.1	13.5	22.5**
	Low 1/3	22.6	13.6	20.4	39.2
1984 - Rev. Sample	High 1/3	12.6**	1.6*	15.5	18.7**
	Low 1/3	22.4	10.6	20.5	44.6

\*Significant difference between adjusted rates of high vs. low score camps for sample/year.

\*\*Significant difference found in all three covariance analyses.

TABLE G-4

Post-camp Outcomes for Type D Camps  
With 1982 and 1984 Camp Release Samples

## I. Recidivism at 24-Months Follow-up

Sample Year	Camp-Type Score	Recidivism Rate, by Risk Level			
		Total	Lower	Medium	Higher
1982	High 1/3	52.2*	30.2**	57.5*	58.7*
	Low 1/3	67.7	51.1	67.7	83.1
1984	High 1/3	53.8	31.1**	61.5	59.9
	Low 1/3	57.2	48.0	56.7	72.2
1984 - Rev. Sample	High 1/3	53.8**	34.4**	60.0	62.0*
	Low 1/3	58.1	50.6	58.9	70.4

## II. State Commitment Rate at 24-Months Follow-up

Sample Year	Camp-Type Score	Commitment Rate, by Risk Level			
		Total	Lower	Medium	Higher
1982	High 1/3	17.1	2.6	25.0	12.2*
	Low 1/3	20.2	15.0	15.0*	36.7
1984	High 1/3	15.3*	2.4	20.4	17.7*
	Low 1/3	21.8	12.9	19.9	38.0
1984 - Rev. Sample	High 1/3	14.7*	3.8	15.7*	27.9
	Low 1/3	20.8	9.8	23.5	32.5

\*Significant difference between adjusted rates of high vs. low score camps for sample/year.

\*\*Significant difference found in all three covariance analyses.

## APPENDIX H

### INTEGRATING THE INFORMATION: AN EXAMPLE

Following is a set of procedures that attempts to illustrate how administrators or policy makers might utilize this report's information with respect to camps that can be modified. The procedures are illustrated via a hypothetical example, combined with actual data from tables in this report.

**Table 13.** After determining the risk levels of all youths in Camp X, say that planners find its youth population contains 36% lower risks, 50% medium risks, and 14% higher risks. Compared to the typical distribution shown in Table 13, this camp has a higher percentage of lower risks. The decision is made to modify Camp X's existing program in an attempt to reduce recidivism for lower risk youths.

**Table 14.** Table 14 indicates that lower recidivism rates were achieved for lower risks by two camp-types: A and D. The next step is for the planners to examine the features of these camp-types and to determine which one most resembles Camp X as it currently exists, or at least which type would call for the least changes or most feasible modification in Camp X's structure and operation.

**Camp-type tables.** Say that planners, by examining these tables and observing Camp X, determine that it most nearly resembles the Camp-Type D description in Table 11. Camp X and Camp-Type D contain the following features:

In comparing the two sets of characteristics, Camp X satisfactorily resembles Camp-Type D on 6 of 11 features. Camp X does not match Type D in length of stay, setting, frequency of offgrounds activities, hours of outside contact, and hours of volunteer services. The following steps might be recommended to achieve parity on these variables.

**Length of stay.** LOS should be increased from the current 166 days to 213 or more (to the extent such action is possible).

Camp Characteristic	Camp-Type D	Camp X	Similar
Length of stay	longer, 213 or more days	166 days	No
Setting	rural	nonrural	No
Camp capacity	smaller, under 50 beds	50 beds	Yes
Living units	single	single	Yes
Offgrounds activities, frequency	higher, 1.5 per week	0.5 per week	No
Academic training, frequency	higher, 5.0 per week	5 per week	Yes
Outside contacts, frequency	higher, 2.3 per week	3 per week	Yes
Outside contacts, hours	more, 7.8 per week	4 per week	No
Volunteer services	more, 6 or more per week	2 per week	No
Youth-staff ratio	less than 1-to-1	same	Yes
Progress through program	stages	same	Yes

**Setting.** Little can be done to change setting.

**Offgrounds activities.** Increase frequency from current 0.5 (which is once every two weeks) to about 1.5 per week (which is actually three events every two weeks). A program increase to once per week would approximate this requirement.

**Volunteer services.** Increase from the current two hours to six or more per week.

**Outside contacts.** Camp X currently matches the recommended frequency of outside contacts, but should increase hours from the current 4 per week to 7.8 or more. Reference to Appendix Table D would further indicate that average hours of outside contacts (7.8) plus the standard deviation (10.1) would equal 17.9 hours, the upper optimum amount. Practically speaking, any amount from 7 to 18 hours of outside contacts would meet the range of this camp-type.

The above example might appear simplistic, since it involves limited or seemingly minor changes, possible costs aside. Based on the present research, however, it is possible that such changes might bring improved performances on outcome measures. When considering program modifications along the lines discussed in this chapter, planners should examine all features of each camp-type that are associated with better outcomes, and should do so by youth risk level when appropriate.