

152463



**CALIFORNIA'S JUVENILE PROBATION CAMPS:  
A VALIDATION STUDY  
PART II: LOS ANGELES COUNTY CAMPS**

NCJRS

JAN 25 1995

ACQUISITIONS

State of California  
Department of the Youth Authority  
Research Division

July 1994

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

**Part II: Los Angeles County Camps**

by

**Robert Wedge and Ted Palmer**

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

**July 1994**

## CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
SUMMARY.....	v
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. BACKGROUND.....	3
Methods.....	4
Glossary.....	5
III. POST-CAMP OUTCOMES.....	7
Youth Characteristics.....	7
Post-camp Outcomes.....	7
IV. CAMP-TYPE VALIDATION.....	11
Validation Process.....	11
Validated Camp-Types.....	11
Similarities and Differences Among Camp-Types.....	13
V. CAMP-TYPE DESCRIPTIONS.....	15
LA Camp-Type 1.....	15
LA Camp-Type 2.....	16
Results Across Camp-Types.....	19
VI. UTILIZING INFORMATION ON CAMP-TYPES.....	21
Choosing a Camp-Type.....	21
VII. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS.....	23
Discussion.....	23
Implications.....	23
REFERENCES.....	27

CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
APPENDIX A: Research Methods.....	29
APPENDIX B: Recidivism Risk Scale .....	33
APPENDIX C: Post-Camp Outcomes for 1982 and 1984 Camp Samples: Los Angeles County .....	35
APPENDIX D: Definitions of Camp Characteristics.....	37
APPENDIX E: Methods Used in Validation of Camp-Types .....	43
APPENDIX F: Seven Highest Scoring Los Angeles County Camps on Two Validated Camp-Types.....	45
APPENDIX G: Post-Camp Outcomes by Camp-Type for 1982 and 1984 Samples: Los Angeles County .....	47
APPENDIX H: Possible Interaction Effects on Outcome Between Camp-Type Factors and Specified Variables .....	49

## LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE 1: Characteristics of Youths in the 1982 and 1984 Los Angeles County Camp Samples.....	8
TABLE 2: Recidivism and State Commitment Rates at 24-Months Follow-up for 1982 and 1984 Satisfactory Releases From Los Angeles County Camps, by Level of Recidivism Risk .....	9
TABLE 3: Sustained Petitions for Violent Offenses Prior to Camp Admission and Following Release for 1982 and 1984 Los Angeles County Camp Samples.....	10
TABLE 4: Composition of Los Angeles Camp-Types: Features, by Direction.....	12
TABLE 5: Camps Achieving Positive Outcomes: LA Type 1.....	15
TABLE 6: Validation Data for LA Camp-Type 1 .....	17
TABLE 7: Camps Achieving Positive Outcomes: LA Type 2.....	18
TABLE 8: Validation Data for LA Camp-Type 2 .....	20
TABLE 9: Percentage of Each Recidivism Risk Level in Typical Camp Population.....	21



## SUMMARY

This study is an adjunct to California's Juvenile Probation Camps Study, which began in 1984 (see list of references). One component of the earlier study was a measure of recidivism and state commitment rates among youths released from juvenile probation camps in 1982. One achievement of the study was the identification of types of camps with significantly more positive outcomes.

It was decided to conduct a follow-up study seeking to both sharpen and verify the results of the original study. Therefore, the study was replicated, this time based on results for youths satisfactorily released from camps during 1984. Los Angeles County camps were studied separately from camps in the remainder of the state. (As did 22 other counties at that time, Los Angeles County operated non-mandated probation camps for juveniles committed by the courts. Camps are part of the range of services offered by the Los Angeles County Probation Department.)

The goals of the present study were to compare recidivism rates found for the 1982 and 1984 samples of camp releases, and to determine if the types of camps that had been found to have more positive outcomes with the 1982 sample also had better outcomes with the later sample. Findings of the study are summarized in the following paragraphs. Findings for camps in counties other than Los Angeles County are presented in Part I of the Validation Study.

### Youth Characteristics

A comparison of the 1982 and 1984 camp release groups showed that youths in the two samples were similar on the large majority of characteristics. The samples were of about the same age and delinquent background, although a larger percentage of 1984 releases had a prior institutional commitment. The 1984 sample also contained a lower percentage of youths who were committed to camp for property offenses and more who were committed for drug-related and miscellaneous other offenses. The average risk-of-recidivism scores for the two Los Angeles County samples were nearly the same: 3.7 vs. 3.8.

## Post-Camp Outcomes for Los Angeles County

Recidivism rates at 24-months follow-up for satisfactory releases were statistically stable over the two periods, being 59.0% for 1982 releases and 62.7% for 1984 releases. There were essentially no differences between the samples in percentage of youths with state commitments. Both samples showed a significant reduction in violent offending during the 24-month follow-up period: down 56.6% for 1982 releases and 41.9% for 1984 releases.

## Camp-Type Findings

In the 1982 study, seven types of LA camps were identified. Using outcomes for 1984 releases, the Validation Study verified three of these types. Two were so similar to each other, however, that they were combined, resulting in two validated camp-types with significantly better outcomes than other LA camps.

**Camp-type 1.** The 24-month recidivism rate for all risk levels released from this type of camp was 44.6%, vs. 56.1% for other camps in 1982, and 52.5% vs. 70.0% in 1984. Stated another way, with 1982 releases Camp-type 1 had rates 11.5 percentage points lower than other camps in 1982. Similarly, in 1984, Camp-type 1 had rates which were 17.5 points lower than those of other camps in 1984.

**Camp-type 2.** This type of camp also achieved more positive probation outcomes. Of particular note, this camp-type had more positive rates with higher risk youths: 50.3% vs. 84.9% in 1982 and 57.2% vs. 82.0% in 1984. Specifically, the recidivism rates were 34.6 percentage points lower for Camp-type 2 in 1982 than for other camps in 1982. Similarly, they were 24.8 percentage points lower for Camp-type 2 in 1984 than for other camps in 1984.

## Implications

The Juvenile Probation Camps Validation Study found statistically significant evidence that some camps in Los Angeles County had lower recidivism rates and state commitment rates than other camps. The study also identified some of the characteristics of the more successful



programs, characteristics found to be highly related to youths' success on probation in the 24-month post-camp period.

In effect, these programs provided a period of incapacitation while youths were in camps, followed by a reduction in violent offending in the community.

These results were more highly associated with some camps than others. An implication of these findings is that it might be possible for camps to lower the recidivism and state commitment rates among releases by adopting the characteristics of the more successful camp-type programs.

## I. INTRODUCTION

This report is part two of a study that attempts to validate the findings of the Camps, Ranches, and Schools Study. Part II presents information pertaining to juvenile probation camps in Los Angeles County. Part I, published separately, presented similar aggregated information for the camps operated by counties other than Los Angeles.

In these reports, a comparison is made between outcomes for two samples of juvenile camp releases: (1) youths released from camps in 1982, with a two-year follow-up through 1984, and (2) youths released during 1984 and again with a two-year follow-up. This comparison is relevant to questions that have been raised about local correctional 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 earlier study was based on outcomes for a sample of youths released in 1982 from 14 camps in Los Angeles County and from 32 camps in 20 other counties.<sup>1</sup>

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 one of Los Angeles County's camp programs, the recidivism rate was 59.0% during the 24-month period following release. During the same follow-up period, 33.7% were committed to state institutions.

However, results also showed that some camps tended to have substantially lower recidivism and/or commitment rates than others. Further examination found that certain groups or sets of interrelated camp characteristics were significantly related to positive post-camp outcomes, particularly in relation to 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 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. The three primary goals of the study were:

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.

---

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

<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.

3. To identify one or more sets of camp characteristics (camp-types) related to better outcomes in both the 1982 and 1984 samples.

Any camp-type found to have significantly better outcomes with both samples could be considered "statistically validated"; as a result, information relating to these camp-types could be used with considerable confidence. The implication of the study is that camps which adopt the characteristics of a more successful camp-type might then achieve more positive probation outcomes, that is, lower recidivism rates, lower state commitment rates, or both.

### **Methods**

A brief outline of the research methods used in this study is provided in Appendix A. For the interested reader, the research and replication methods are more fully described in Part I of the Validation Study Report. Additional detail on methods can be found in California's Juvenile Probation Camps Study Report No. 4. Some of the terms frequently used in this report are defined in the accompanying glossary.

---

## GLOSSARY

ADJUSTED RATES	These are rates of recidivism and commitment 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 in 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 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. More information about these terms may be found in Probation Camps Study Report No. 4.



### III. POST-CAMP OUTCOMES

#### Youth Characteristics

Table 1 displays the characteristics of the 1984 validation sample and the original 1982 Los Angeles County camp sample. A comparison of the figures indicates that the two samples are quite similar, showing significant differences on only two characteristics. Compared to the 1982 sample, the 1984 sample:

- had a larger percentage of youths with one or more prior institutional commitments.
- had a lower percentage of youths committed for property offenses, with a slightly higher percentage committed for drugs and miscellaneous other offenses.

No significant differences were found on other characteristics. The average recidivism risk score was nearly the same—3.7 vs. 3.8. Generally, the risk score is a relative measure of the likelihood or probability that a youth will recidivate. See Appendix B for a description of the risk scale and how to obtain scores on individual youths.

#### Post-camp Outcomes

**Recidivism and state commitment.** Camps that had better post-camp outcomes with the 1982 sample generally were those with more positive outcomes with the 1984 sample. Recidivism and state commitment rates for the 1982 and 1984 samples are shown in Table 2, for youths with satisfactory camp releases. The recidivism rate for the total release group was 59.0% in 1982 and 62.7% in 1984. The differences between 1982 and 1984 outcome rates for satisfactory releases are not statistically significant, indicating that outcomes for Los Angeles County camps were stable, at least over the two-year follow-up period. Outcomes for both satisfactory and unsatisfactory removals and for the total, combined sample are shown in Appendix C, at 6-, 12-, 18-, and 24-months follow-up.



TABLE 1

Characteristics of Youths in the 1982 and 1984  
Los Angeles County Camp Samples

Youth Characteristics		Camp Sample	
		1982	1984
Sample Size	No.	909	822
Avg. Age at 1st Sustained Petition	Avg.	14.6	14.5 n.s.
Pct. with 1 or More Prior Sustained Petitions Excluding Commitment Offense	%	71.8	68.4 n.s.
Avg. No. of Prior Sustained Petitions	Avg.	1.3	1.3 n.s.
Pct. with Prior Institutional Commitments	%	18.5	24.8 *
Pct. with 1 or More Prior Violent Offenses Including Commitment Offense:	%	42.7	41.8 n.s.
Person	%	31.8	30.9
Property	%	56.3	45.1 *
Drugs	%	2.6	10.9
Other	%	9.2	13.0
Age at Release from Camp	Avg.	16.4	16.3 n.s.
Length of Stay in Days	Avg.	217	225 n.s.
Avg. Recidivism Risk Scale Score	Avg.	3.7	3.8 n.s.

\*Difference between samples is statistically significant for prior commitments and commitment offenses. n.s. indicates that the difference is non-significant.

**Outcomes by risk level.** Table 2 also shows the recidivism and state commitment rates for the two samples grouped by level of risk. There were no significant differences between the 1982 and 1984 releases in any risk level.

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

TABLE 2

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

Risk Level	Sample	N	Recidivism		Commitment	
			N	%	N	%
Total Satisfactory Releases	1982	909	536	59.0	306	33.7
	1984	822	515	62.7	259	31.5
Lower Risks	1982	308	161	52.3	76	24.7
	1984	291	162	55.7	68	23.4
Medium Risks	1982	484	293	60.5	170	35.1
	1984	427	279	65.3	148	34.7
Higher Risks	1982	117	82	70.1	60	51.3
	1984	104	74	71.2	43	41.3

Note. There are no significant differences between the 1982 and 1984 rates shown in Table 2.

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.

These data indicate that for the 1982 sample the number of violent offenders decreased 55.6% from the pre- to post-period, and the number of violent offenses decreased 56.6%. A somewhat smaller, but still significant, reduction in violent offending was also found for the 1984 sample: violent offenders down 34.7%, violent offenses down 41.9%.

It is recognized that those who committed violent offenses during follow-up may have been reincarcerated and, therefore, not at-large to commit another offense, violent or otherwise. Nevertheless, the data show substantial reductions in violent behavior following camp release for both the 1982 and 1984 samples. Other measures relating 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	40.2%	27.4%
Of those with prior violence, pct. who committed violent offense after release	20.0%	24.9%
Of those with no prior violence, pct. who committed a violent offense after release	16.4%	15.2%

TABLE 3

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

24 Mos. Following Release	1982 Sample		1984 Sample	
	No. of Youths	No. of Violent Petitions	No. of Youths	No. of Violent Petitions
Total Sample	909		822	
24 Mos. Prior to Camp	365	426	225	267
24 Mos. Following Release	162	185	147	155
Decrease*	N			
	%			
		-203	-78	-112
		-55.6	-34.7	-41.9

\*Decrease in number of violent offenders was statistically significant in both the 1982 and 1984 samples.

## 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 were generally among those with more positive outcomes with the 1984 sample. The program characteristics of these more successful camps were used to develop "camp-types." The concept of camp-types was tested by subjecting each one to a set of stringent validation procedures. These procedures are described in Appendix E. Of the seven types of Los Angeles County camps found in the original study, four were not validated, three maintained their statistical significance in the replication process and can be considered validated. However, two of the validated regression-types were in effect so similar to each other that it was decided to combine the two sets of descriptive characteristics into a single camp-type.

Of the resulting two camp-types, the following can be said:

- Camps with high scores on either camp-type had significantly better probation outcomes compared to camps with low scores, based on analysis of the 1982 sample.
- Camps with high scores on the two camp-types also had significantly better outcomes compared to camps with low scores, using the 1984 sample.

### Validated Camp-Types

In a following section, the two validated camp-types for Los Angeles County are described. Outcomes for camps with high scores on these camp-types are compared with those for camps with low scores on the camp-types. This analysis was completed 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 differences between the groups of youths being compared.

Table 4 lists the camp characteristics that make up the two validated camp-types. Definitions of these camp characteristics appear in Appendix D and more detailed descriptions may be found in the Probation Camps Study Report No. 4.

TABLE 4  
Composition of Los Angeles Camp-types:  
Features, by Direction

Camp Feature	Measure	LA Type 1	LA Type 2
<u>GENERAL FEATURES</u>			
Camp Capacity			
Total Capacity Used		Lower	Lower
Living Unit Capacity			Lower
Living Arrangement			Rooms
Length of Stay in Camp		Longer	
<u>PROGRAM FEATURES<sup>a</sup></u>			
Counseling Services	Hours	More	More
Counseling Services	Freq.		Higher
Vocational Training	Freq.	Lower	
Academic Training	Hours		More
Religious Services	Freq.	Higher	
Recreation	Hours		More
Recreation	Freq.	Lower	Higher
Offgrounds Activities	Hours		More
Outside Contacts	Freq.		Higher
<u>OTHER FEATURES</u>			
Total Youth/Staff Ratio			Higher
Treatment Youth/Staff Ratio			Higher
Volunteer Services	Hours		More
Case Reviews			Youth Present
Program Assignment			Individual

<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 counseling services" were found to have an average of 8.2 hours per week.

### Similarities and Differences Among Camp-Types

There was the possibility that the process of developing camp-types had simply identified a single cluster of characteristics commonly related to a single group of camps with uniformly better probation outcomes. In other words, it was necessary to determine whether the two validated camp-types were not just two different configurations of the same 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.

Measures of commonality. By examining Table 4, a simple check on the commonality of items in the Los Angeles County camp-types demonstrates that, while not totally independent, each camp-type is a unique mixture of characteristics. Of the 32 available camp characteristics, 19 appeared on at least one of the camp-type scales. The two types had only three variables in common and one of these was scored in the opposite direction. Of the 14 Los Angeles County camps taking part in the study, only three scored among the top 50% on both types. The camps scoring high on both types were Gonzales, Kirby, and Mira Loma North (now closed). A list of high-scoring camps is in Appendix F.



## V. CAMP-TYPE DESCRIPTIONS

As indicated, both camp-types in this report are derived from Los Angeles County. The camp-types are labeled 1 and 2 and are denoted as LA Camp-Types. Validation Study Report Part I contains descriptions of camp-types from counties other than Los Angeles.

### LA Camp-Type 1

This camp-type is comprised of the results of two regression analyses: one for lower risk youths and one for all youths combined. The camp variables resulting from these two regressions were so similar that it was decided to combine them into one camp-type.

Characteristics of LA Camp-Type 1. The salient feature of this program is counseling. Table 5 lists the individual characteristics of camps classified as Type 1. Also shown is each variable's weight or relative importance in defining the camp-type. See glossary on page 5 for discussion of "variable weight."

TABLE 5  
Camps Achieving Positive Outcomes:  
LA Type 1

Features	Type, Amount, Direction	Weight
<u>GENERAL FEATURES</u>		
Length of Stay	longer: more than 213 days	6.5
Capacity Used	medium or lower: less than 95%	4.2
<u>PROGRAM FEATURES</u>		
Counseling services	more hours: avg. 8.2/wk	20.9
Vocational Training	lower freq: avg. 0.3/wk	6.9
Recreation	lower freq: avg. 5.3/wk	1.3
Religious Activities	higher freq: avg. 1.6/wk	2.3



Camps grouped as Type 1 are typically less crowded (occupancy rate of less than 95%) and have a longer-than-average length of stay: 213 or more days (7.0 mos.). The program is characterized by above-average hours of counseling and a higher frequency of religious activities. In addition, there are fewer than average recreational activities and vocational training occurs less than once a week.

**Validation outcomes.** Camps with scores in the top third on this type had the following significant post-camp outcomes:

- Lower recidivism rates with lower risk youths.
- Lower recidivism rates with all risks combined.

Table 6 shows that the four camps with highest scores on Camp-type 1 had significantly lower recidivism rates in both the 1982 and 1984 samples for lower risks and for all youths combined. Camps with higher scores on Type 1 are listed in Appendix F.

Recidivism rates for all risks combined in Type 1 camps were as much as 17.5 percentage-points lower than for camps scoring low on Type 1. Likewise, Type 1 recidivism rates for lower-risk youths were as much as 18.5 points lower.

In addition, outcome results suggest a tendency for Type 1 camps to have lower recidivism rates with both medium and higher risk youths. There is also a general tendency (nonsignificant, statistically) for Type 1 camps to have lower state commitment rates. More complete data on recidivism and commitment rates achieved with each risk level by high and low scoring camps are shown in Appendix G-1, separately for the 1982 and 1984 youth samples.

### **LA Camp-Type 2**

This camp-type is derived from a factor analysis of 32 measures of camp characteristics. This analysis identified fifteen characteristics which, when pooled together, described a major group of Los Angeles County 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.

TABLE 6

## Validation Data for LA Camp-Type 1

RECIDIVISM RATES FOR ALL RISKS COMBINED		
Level of Score on Type 1	1982	1984
High-score Camps	44.6	52.5
Low-Score Camps	56.1	70.0
Difference	11.5	17.5
RECIDIVISM RATES FOR LOWER RISKS		
	1982	1984
High-score Camps	35.1	46.0
Low-Score Camps	50.9	64.5
Difference	15.8	18.5

All differences are statistically significant. Rates are for 24-months follow-up.

**Characteristics of LA Camp-Type 2.** Salient features of this program are counseling, academic training, physical activities, and community ties. The individual characteristics of camps classified as Type 2 are listed in Table 7. Type 2 camps tend to be smaller, less crowded camps that more often than not house youths in rooms rather than dorms. The programs in these camps emphasize counseling, academic training, and recreation; they also feature more hours of offgrounds activities and a higher frequency of outside contacts. These camps have a higher youth/staff ratio, that is, there is more than an average number of youths per staff. And finally, youths in these camps are assigned programs on an individual basis and are present at case reviews.

TABLE 7  
Camps Achieving Positive Outcomes:  
LA Type 2

Features	Type, Amount, Direction	Weight
<u>GENERAL FEATURES</u>		
Living Unit Capacity	lower: under 33 beds	8.3
Living Arrangement	rooms more than dorms	7.6
Capacity Used	medium or lower: under 95%	5.1
<u>PROGRAM FEATURES</u>		
Counseling Services	more hours: avg. 8.2/wk	8.0
Counseling Services	higher freq: avg. 4.0/wk	6.8
Offgrounds Activities	more hours: avg. 20.9/wk	5.0
Outside Contacts	higher freq: avg. 2.3/wk	4.6
Academic Training	more hours: avg. 24.8/wk	4.1
Recreation	more hours: avg. 19.7/wk	3.5
Recreation	higher freq: avg. 9.3/wk	3.0
<u>STAFF VARIABLES</u>		
Ratio: Youths-to-Total Staff	higher ratio: 1-to-1 or more	7.6
Ratio: Youths to Treatment Staff	higher ratio: 1.5-to-1 or more	7.6
Volunteer Services	more: 6.0 hours or more/mo.	
<u>CASE PROCESSING</u>		
Case Reviews	youth present	6.2
Program Assignment	individual	4.4

Validation outcomes. Camps that scored in the top one-third of all camps on this type had the following significant post-camp outcomes:

- Lower recidivism rates with higher risk youth.
- Lower recidivism rates with all risks combined.
- Lower commitment rates with medium risk youth.
- Lower commitment rates with all risks combined.

Table 8 shows that the camps with the higher scores on Camp-type 2 had significantly lower recidivism rates in both the 1982 and 1984 samples for higher risks and for all youths combined. These camps also had significantly lower state commitment rates for medium risks and for all risks combined. The camps with higher scores on Type 2 are listed in Appendix F.

Recidivism rates among higher risk youths were markedly lower for Type 2 camps: In the 1982 sample, the rates for Type 2 camps were 34.6 points lower. In addition, in that same sample Type 2 camps had a commitment rate of 25.7% for all risks combined, compared to a rate of 44.3% for camps with lower scores on Type 2. More complete data on recidivism and commitment rates achieved by high and low scoring camps with each risk level are shown in Appendix G-2, separately for the 1982 and 1984 youth samples.

### **Results Across Camp-Types**

Specifically, for all youths combined—that is, higher, medium, and lower risks together—the average recidivism difference in the type of 1984 camp that was more successful than were other 1984 camps was 14.9 percentage points at 24 months post-camp follow-up (this equaled a 21.4% recidivism difference). For 1982 releases the average difference was 15.7 percentage points. Again for all youths combined, the average difference in state commitment rates, for the 1984 releases, was 15.3 percentage points at 24-months follow-up (a 38.2% difference in commitments). For the 1982 releases the difference in commitment rates was 18.6 percentage points.

TABLE 8

Validation Data for LA Camp-Type 2

RECIDIVISM RATES FOR ALL RISKS COMBINED		
Level of Score on Type 2	1982	1984
High-score Camps	50.2	57.3
Low-Score Camps	69.0	69.6
Difference	18.8	12.3
RECIDIVISM RATES FOR HIGHER RISKS		
	1982	1984
High-score Camps	50.3	57.2
Low-Score Camps	84.9	82.0
Difference	34.6	24.8
COMMITMENT RATES FOR ALL RISKS COMBINED		
	1982	1984
High-score Camps	35.1	46.0
Low-Score Camps	50.9	64.5
Difference	15.8	18.5
COMMITMENT RATES MEDIUM FOR RISKS		
	1982	1984
High-score Camps	25.6	23.6
Low-Score Camps	46.1	46.7
Difference	20.5	23.1

All differences are statistically significant. Rates are for 24-months follow-up.

See Appendix H for a discussion of possible interaction effects on outcome between camp-type factors, on the one hand, and variables such as age, length of stay, secure-nonsecure camp status, and disciplinary transfers, on the other.

## VI. UTILIZING INFORMATION ON CAMP-TYPES

### Choosing a Camp-Type

This section is directed to administrators, practitioners, policy makers, and others who might wish to use the camp-type information to modify existing programs or to develop new programs for planned future juvenile facilities. As a first step, it should be determined what percentage of each youth risk group is in the target population. (See Appendix B for risk scale scoring instructions.) Table 9 shows the distribution of risk levels in the "typical" Los Angeles camp population; it indicates that the range of distributions is very small for each risk level.

TABLE 9  
Percentage of Each Recidivism Risk Level  
in Typical Camp Population

<u>Risk Level</u>	<u>Range of Percentages</u>
Lower	34% to 35%
Medium	52% to 53%
Higher	12% to 13%

---

Note. Generally, if a camp's population contains a percentage of a risk group which is larger than that shown in the table, the camp-type selected for adaptation should be one identified as being more successful with that risk level.

Both available camp-types produce lower recidivism rates for all types of youths combined—rates anywhere from 11.5% to 18.8% lower than camps without the specified camp-type characteristics. However, Camp-type 1 has also been shown to produce better outcomes with lower risk youths, while Camp-type 2 additionally shows better results with medium and higher risks.

Although it might seem reasonable to combine the elements of the two camp-types into one best-of-all camp-type, users are cautioned against combining elements from the two camp-types.

These elements, in their new combination, may produce results somewhat different than those with which they were associated in their original mixture or even by themselves. For example, longer length of stay is related to lower recidivism in Type 1 camps. In Type 2 camps, length of stay was not found to be associated with lower recidivism, and, if added to the elements of Type 2, might have unwelcome results.

**Adopting camp features.** In adopting the features of either one of the camp-types, the "variable weights" should be considered. The higher the weight, the stronger the association between the feature and positive outcomes.

Some features—mainly physical and structural conditions such as camp capacity or living unit size—are in effect unchangeable (except when constructing a new camp). If the camp-type selected for adaptation contains such immutable features, and if one's target camp presently lacks these features, the policy maker 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 probably 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 features of the camp-type are also present.

## VII. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

### Discussion

This study has provided information on the recidivism and state commitment rates of juvenile probation camps in Los Angeles County. The study also identified and validated two camp-types, each having been shown to attain either lower recidivism rates or lower state commitment rates, or both, compared to other camps.

This report attempts to synthesize a large volume of information on the juvenile probation camp system. More complete information may be found in the reports of the precursor study. Probation Camps Study Report No. 4 is especially relevant in providing information on the development, definition, and measurement of camp-types. The culmination of knowledge gained in the Validation Study may be in the specification of combinations of program components that produce lower recidivism and state commitment rates than camps in general.

### 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 of offenders, and "rehabilitation and treatment" of adjudicated youth. In the Juvenile Probation Camps Validation Study, public protection was evidenced by the number of youthful offenders incarcerated for an average of 7.4 months in camps operated by Los Angeles County. Such protection was further indicated by the reduction of violent offending following camp release.

Non-recidivism was also equated with protection of the public. Of a group of youths released during 1982, 41.0% had no further sustained petitions or convictions for a period of two years. This success rate decreased slightly to 37.3% for 1984 camp releases.

Of those youths released from camps in 1982, 33.7% were committed to state institutions. The rate of state commitments was 31.5% among releases in 1984. It is speculated that without the local camp system, even greater numbers of youths would be committed to state institutions, which are currently over capacity. While available data do not allow an exact determination of



the number of additional commitments, this can be extrapolated. The 1984 cohort for Los Angeles County had the following outcomes:

- 100.0% Represented by the total number of satisfactory releases in 1984.
- 37.3% Nonrecidivists successfully retained in community for at least two years.
- 62.7% Recidivists, of whom:
  - 31.5% were committed to the state;
  - 31.2% were not committed, but were handled alternatively in the community by probation continuance or return to camp.

These percentages can be used to make the following rough projections. There are an estimated 2,820 youths satisfactorily released from Los Angeles County camps each year. Of these, 1,768 (62.7%) will recidivate, and of those recidivists, 557 (31.5%) will be committed to state institutions. Of the estimated 1,052 recidivists currently being handled at the local level (such as by probation continuance, hall commitment, or return to camp), it seems probable that, without the county camp system, some unknown and indeterminable number of youths would be considered eligible for commitment to the state. It seems especially likely that many camp releases charged with serious offenses, such as robbery, assault, burglary, major drug usage or sales, etc., would be sentenced to state institutions rather than placed in local camps, two-thirds of which are nonsecure custody settings.

The study achieved its goal of identifying some camp programs that maintained substantially lower recidivism rates than others. This, in itself, tends to lend support to the viability and utility of probation camps. Furthermore, the study indicated that improvements can be made in the performance of camps in terms of achieving lower recidivism and state commitment rates. For instance, it was found that some Los Angeles County camps had recidivism rates above 75%, while others were below 50%. One implication of this study is that if

camps with higher rates were to adopt various 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 I: Counties other than Los Angeles. 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 youths in the 1982 and 1984 samples. The second involved a comparison of the recidivism and state commitment rates observed for the two samples. The third area of analysis dealt with determining whether the sets of camp variables found to be related to better outcomes for the 1982 sample were also significantly and positively related for the 1984 sample.

This appendix contains an outline of the steps taken and research methods employed in the validation analysis. The statistical derivation of camp-types with more positive outcomes is more fully discussed in Probation Camps Report No. 4.

#### Sample Selection

- A random sample of 909 males was selected from all youths released from Los Angeles County camps during 1982.
- A second sample was comprised of 822 randomly selected youths who resided in these camps in July 1984 and were released during 1984 and, in a few cases, 1985.

#### Youth Characteristics

- The characteristics of the two youth samples were identified and compared.
- A "risk-of-recidivism" score was calculated for each youth.

#### Post-Camp Outcome Analysis

- Youths in each sample were followed for 24 months after camp release. Follow-up was limited to youths who had satisfactorily completed a camp program.
- Recidivism and state commitment rates for the two samples were compared. Recidivism was defined as a sustained petition in juvenile court or a conviction in adult

court. Commitment was placement in a Youth Authority or Department of Corrections institution.

### **Identification of Camps With More Successful Outcomes**

- Camps with lower recidivism and commitment rates were identified.
- Rates for each camp were adjusted by using recidivism risk scores as covariates to account for possible differences among youth populations in the camps.

### **Development of "Camp-Types"**

- Camps were ranked by their recidivism rates, then divided at the midpoint into higher and lower recidivism rate groups.
- Stepwise regression analysis and factor analysis were used to identify groups of camp characteristics which, taken together, most successfully identified (predicted) those camps with lower recidivism rates. The same steps were repeated using commitment rates.
- Those variable sets that were similarly identified in both the 1982 and 1984 analyses were used to develop scoring keys for "camp-types," with each variable assigned a weight based on its statistical importance within the set of variables delineating a camp-type.
- Individual camps were then scored on each camp-type and those camps with a score in the top one-third of the range of scores for all camps were said to have high scores on that type, that is, to have characteristics highly similar to those comprising the type.
- When the group of camps that scored high on a camp-type had significantly lower recidivism or commitment rates than camps that scored low on that camp-type in both the 1982 and 1984 samples, the camp-type was considered to be validated. These procedures resulted in two Los Angeles County camp-types.

- In this instance, validation means that a set of camp characteristics (a camp-type) successfully identified camps with statistically better outcomes in two independent populations.





## 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 predict 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) number of 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:  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY**

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	909	29.2	45.4	54.2	59.0	33.7
	1984	822	26.0	44.3	54.6	62.7	31.5
Unsatisfactory	1982	80	72.5*	82.5*	90.0*	90.0	82.5
	1984	47	44.7	61.7	74.5	78.7	59.6
Total Releases	1982	989	32.7*	48.4	57.1	61.5	37.6*
	1984	869	27.0	45.2	55.7	63.5	33.0

\*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	308	24.7	39.3	47.7	52.3	24.7
	1984	291	21.7	40.6	48.8	55.7	23.4
Medium Risk	1982	484	30.0	46.5	55.0	60.5	35.1
	1984	427	26.5	46.1	57.4	65.3	34.7
Higher Risk	1982	117	37.6	57.3	68.4	70.1	51.3
	1984	104	36.5	47.1	59.6	71.2	41.4

A comparison of outcome rates by risk level found no significant difference between 1982 and 1984 samples.

<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. Averages or amounts are based on all camps combined, statewide.

**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."

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 ( $8.2 + 5.5 = 13.7$ ).

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. Fourteen camps had no vocational training.

**Frequency.** "More frequent" vocational training occurred about 4 times weekly (4.3 avg.). Since 14 camps had no vocational program, the average lower frequency was less than once (0.3) per week.

### 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).

**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 equaled 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

### METHODS USED IN VALIDATION OF CAMP-TYPES

The validation of Los Angeles County camp-types involved several replication procedures. The process began with the seven camp-types identified in the 1982 study. Camps with high scores on each of 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 these 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 three of the seven camp-types had significantly better outcomes with the same risk levels in both the 1982 and 1984 samples.

**Step 2.** Six of the original seven camp-types derived in 1982 were comprised of groups of camp characteristics (variables) selected by regression analysis as being related to and predictive of more positive outcomes. 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 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 those variables which, although not selected by regression, were independently and statistically correlated to positive outcomes in both the 1982 and 1984 samples. This process resulted in two "composite" camp-types to be tested at the next level of validation.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Two regression-types were identified, but item content was so similar that the two scales were merged into one.

**Step 3.** The final level of validation was designed to compare outcomes for camps scoring high on the two resulting camp-type scales (one regression scale and one factor scale) with outcomes for those camps scoring low. The analysis was based on outcomes with the 1984 sample.

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

APPENDIX F

SEVEN HIGHEST SCORING LOS ANGELES COUNTY CAMPS  
ON TWO VALIDATED CAMP-TYPES

<u>LA Type 1</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>LA Type 2</u>	<u>Score</u>
Gonzales*	36.6	Dorothy Kirby*	65.8
Dorothy Kirby*	34.3	Mira Loma North*	60.0
Mira Loma North*	27.8	Afflerbaugh	47.8
Munz	19.9	Paige	46.5
Holton	18.9	Mendenhall*	45.3
Mendenhall*	15.7	Gonzales*	43.5
Kilpatrick	13.4	Scudder	42.6

\*Four camps scored in the top 50% on both camp-types.

Four camps scored high on one of the two types only:

Type 1 - Munz and Holton

Type 2 - Afflerbaugh and Paige



**APPENDIX G**

**POST-CAMP OUTCOMES BY CAMP-TYPE FOR 1982 AND 1984 SAMPLES:  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY**

**TABLE G-1**

Post-Camp Outcomes for LA Type 1 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	44.6*	35.1*	48.8	61.5
	Low 1/3	56.1	50.9	56.6	70.1
1984	High 1/3	52.5*	46.0*	58.0*	45.9*
	Low 1/3	70.0	64.5	72.7	76.4

**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	27.8	21.5	29.8	42.1
	Low 1/3	33.3	22.4	37.8	52.7
1984	High 1/3	21.8	19.0	22.9	23.4
	Low 1/3	37.3	32.9	43.5	29.9

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



TABLE G-2

Post-Camp Outcomes for LA Type 2 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	50.2*	42.8	54.4	50.3**
	Low 1/3	69.0	64.0	67.0	84.9
1984	High 1/3	57.3*	53.5	58.4	57.2*
	Low 1/3	69.6	58.6	73.7	82.0

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	25.7*	22.7	25.6*	32.3*
	Low 1/3	44.3	31.1	46.1	64.4
1984	High 1/3	24.8*	20.2	23.6*	48.3
	Low 1/3	40.1	27.7	46.7	46.4

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

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

## APPENDIX H

### POSSIBLE INTERACTION ON OUTCOME BETWEEN CAMP-TYPE FACTORS AND SPECIFIED VARIABLES

During the Camps Validation Study it became clear that Los Angeles County had some possibly unique problems and differences that may have had a direct or indirect (interaction) effect on both the identification of factors comprising a camp-type and the outcomes (recidivism and state commitment rates) associated with specific camp-types.

#### Effect of Inter-camp Transfers on Measurement of Length of Stay

One area of concern was the occurrence of transfers of youths from one camp to another and how this could impact the measurement and effect of length of stay in any given program. In many instances, these transfers involved the disciplinary removal of a youth from a nonsecure to a secure camp. The following possible interaction was posited: As a result of the transfer of disciplinary removals from one camp to another, the effectiveness of a camp may be more a reflection of a particular combination of open and secure programs than one versus the other.

The study design took into account this possible effect of transfers and, as discussed below, of length of stay as well. Regarding transfers, camp staff were asked to identify each camp release as a satisfactory release or an unsatisfactory removal; the latter included disciplinary removals. The camp-type analysis was designed to include only those youths identified as satisfactory releases. If a transferred youth was included in the analysis, camp staff were asked to identify the camp in which that youth had spent most of his time and/or from which he was ultimately released under satisfactory circumstances.

In addition, all analyses of outcomes by camp-type included a statistical control for three major variables: age at admission, length of stay, and secure-nonsecure camp status. Length of stay (LOS) was measured two ways. First, LOS was counted as the actual time spent in camp by the youth. Second, all camps were categorized into shorter, medium, and longer LOS categories according to the average LOS of all satisfactory releases from camp. LOS, as measured for each youth, was entered as a statistical (control) covariate. The measure of LOS, as an average for the camp, was treated as a camp-type factor.

Therefore, the analysis of outcomes (camp effectiveness) took into account possible concerns regarding LOS and disciplinary transfers. It did so by (1) limiting the analysis to satisfactory releases (transfers were excluded) and by (2) statistically controlling for length of stay. In addition, each analysis statistically controlled for secure-nonsecure camp status, thereby equalizing the direct and indirect effects of this factor across all camps.

#### **Effects of Age on Program Variables Such as Academic and Vocational Training**

Project staff were aware of various problems and potential issues associated with measuring the effect of program variables on camp-type and outcomes. It was recognized, for instance, that younger youths (under 16) would—routinely—more often be assigned to academic programs, whereas older youths (16 and up) would more often be assigned to vocational training, even though both types of programming were often received by youths of any age. This circumstance led to the following speculation by one reviewer of the final draft: The fact that younger minors have different academic requirements than older minors may not have been factored into the analysis of camp-types and outcomes.

To address this and related issues, age at release was included as a statistical control variable in all analyses. Although this procedure may not have fully controlled for differential outcomes on the part of programs with more academic or more vocational programming, it probably controlled for much or most of it. Moreover, the research study was purposely designed to avoid the development of camp-types that were age-specific. For example, with regard to camp operations (programming), it was not considered desirable to develop programs for 17-year-olds and to develop separate, specific programs for 16-year-olds, for 15-year-olds, and so on. Thus, since most camps contained youths of all ages (even camps for older boys often had some younger, more sophisticated wards), it was considered more useful to develop camp-types that could be used with a general camp population of mixed ages, rather than develop age-specific camp-types.

It is recognized that there may still be some level of interaction between age and academic-type, on the one hand, versus vocational-type programs. on the other, that the present analysis did not identify or define. This issue should be further explored in future research, whether or not age and length of stay are statistically controlled.