

The Effectiveness of Short-term Drug Treatment for Jail Inmates:  
An Evaluation of the OUT Program

Stephen J. Bahr\*  
Brigham Young University

Paul E. (Lish) Harris  
Florida State University

Janalee Hobson

Bryan Taylor  
Brigham Young University

We are grateful for the cooperation of the Utah County Jail, the staff of the On Unit Treatment (OUT) Program, and the program participants. Research assistance was provided by James E. Fisher, Jaime Lauchner, Jesse Ure, Wade Stewart, and Stacy Jackson. This research was supported by the Department Sociology and the College of Family, Home, and Social Sciences, Brigham Young University.

\*2031 JFSB, Department of Sociology, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602. [stephen\\_bahr@byu.edu](mailto:stephen_bahr@byu.edu)

4.6.2009

## Abstract

In this study we compared 70 jail inmates who took the OUT program, a cognitive-based drug treatment program, with a matched group of 70 inmates who did not take the program. We used three different measures of recidivism, (1) any re-arrest, (2) a re-arrest that resulted in more than 30 days in jail, and (3) returning to prison or jail for more than 30 days. Fifteen percent fewer of the treatment than control group were sent back to prison or jail for more than 30 days. Using survival analysis to control for exposure time and other variables, the treatment group was almost half as likely to recidivate as the control group. We conclude that the success of the OUT program may be due to its focus, cognitive-behavioral principles, and effective implementation. The Cognitive Transformation Theory is a useful framework for understanding the OUT program and identifying principles that could be used in similar treatment programs.

### The Effectiveness of Drug Treatment for Jail Inmates: An Evaluation of the OUT Program

During the past 25 years there has been a dramatic increase in the number of persons incarcerated in the United States. From 1980 to 2007, the number in prison per 100,000 U.S. residents increased more than three and one-half times from 139 to 506 (Greenfeld & Balog, 1987; West & Sabol, 2008). In 2007, there were 2.3 million in prisons and jails in the United States, about one in every 100 adults; one in every 37 adults has served time in prison or jail (Bonczar, 2003; Glaze & Bonczar, 2008; Pew Center on the States, 2008; Sabol & Couture, 2008).

Ninety-five percent of all jail and prison inmates will be released to reintegrate into communities (Petersilia, 2003, 2005). During 2006 more than 713,000 were released from prison or an average of almost 2,000 per day (Sabol & Couture, 2008). This is more than four times the number of U.S. prisoners that were released 25 years ago.

A critical policy question is what can be done to help offenders to reenter society successfully and avoid future criminal behavior. Many who are released from jail and prison have difficulty adjusting to life after release and completing their probation or parole successfully (Shinkfield & Graffam, 2009). To illustrate, in a recent study of U.S. parolees, two-thirds were rearrested within three years of release and 52 percent were re-incarcerated (Langan & Levin, 2002). In 1980, only 20 percent of U.S. prison admissions were parole violators; by 2007 this had increased to 33 percent (Blumstein & Beck, 2005; Steen & Opsal, 2007).

Although many programs have been developed and advertized as being effective, there has been relatively little empirical research to verify those assertions (Mumola and Bonczar, 1998; Nolan, 2002; Visher, 2006; Wilson, 2000). Marlowe (2006) lamented the tendency to tout unproven interventions without good scientific evidence. There is a great need for empirical research which evaluates the effectiveness of correctional treatment programs in jails and prisons.

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of the On-Unit Treatment

(OUT) program at the Utah County Jail. Our objective is to determine if participants in the OUT program are less likely to be re-arrested and returned to jail or prison than comparable offenders who do not take the OUT program. In the process we hope to be able to better understand some of the principles underlying treatment programs that can be used to improve services to offenders in and outside of jails and prisons.

## Background

There continues to be debate about what helps offenders desist from crime (Healy & O'Donnell, 2008; Pearson, Lipton, Cleland, & Yee, 2002; Marlowe; 2006; Wormwith, Althouse, Simpson, Reitzel, Fagan, & Morgan; 2007). Existing research indicates that correctional programs can work if they are focused, implemented well, help develop skills, and use cognitive-behavioral methods (Landenberger & Lipsey, 2005; MacKenzie, 2000). However, systematic evaluations of some prison programs have failed to demonstrate that they are effective (Marlowe, 2006; Wilson & Davis, 2006).

One of the major impediments to successful reentry is drug use. To illustrate, about two-thirds of arrestees were using an illegal substance at the time of their arrest (National Institute of Justice, 2000; U.S. Census Bureau, 2003). More than one-third of arrestees were found to be at risk for dependence on drugs (National Institute of Justice, 2000). Sixteen percent of convicted jail inmates said they had committed their offense to get money for drugs (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1998).

Since drug use is pervasive among offenders and is a major reason for recidivism, it follows that drug treatment may be a critical component to help reduce recidivism. Without drug treatment, the cyclical movement of criminals between society and the criminal justice system is likely to continue (McColl, 2002).

## Research Objectives

The On-Unit Treatment (OUT) Program is a substance abuse intervention program located in the Utah County Jail. It is a cognitive-behavioral program with a number of elements that are similar to other cognitive-behavioral programs. The information from this evaluation may be useful in assessing and improving the OUT program as well as other drug treatment programs in jails and prisons.

The OUT program is a collaborative venture between the Utah County Division of Substance Abuse and the Utah County Security Center. Established in 1997 under the direction of Val Ellison, it started as a six week long program with the initial goal of enhancing the lives of inmates with extensive drug problems. It evolved into a 30-day program which utilizes cognitive value-based strategies to alter criminal thinking and behavior. The program is now maintained by four staff members working directly in the jail, collectively teaching victim impact, education, and creative therapy classes. The program welcomes inmates with all types of drug problems to apply to the program once they are placed in privileged housing. The program is open to both men and women who are housed and taught separately, preventing interaction.

Although the OUT Program has received accolades from inmates and officials, it has not been evaluated empirically. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the program empirically to determine if there is evidence that the program is effective. Evaluations of some well recognized programs that many believed were effective have failed to provide any evidence of effectiveness

For example, the Greenlight program was a short-term, intensive prison-based program that many believed was effective. However, researchers found no difference between those who did and did not take the program (Wilson & Davis, 2006). In fact, on all arrests, the treatment group was significantly worse than the control group.

The results from the Greenlight program demonstrate the need to evaluate programs systematically rather than rely on client satisfaction, testimonials, and anecdotal evidence. Large sums of money are being spent on many types of treatment programs without adequate evaluative data. High quality evaluations are essential to identify strengths and weaknesses of programs and provide valid information that can be used in improving programs and making wise decisions regarding the allocation of scarce funds. MacKenzie (2000) observed that relatively few policy decisions in corrections use scientific evidence to assist in making informed decisions. Visher (2006) observed that research and practice are moving on independent tracks and that the gulf between them is wide. One way to narrow that gap is to conduct high quality evaluations like this evaluation of the OUT program.

The OUT program utilizes cognitive-behavioral methods to help offenders with drug problems. There is evidence the cognitive-behavioral methods can be effective in helping offenders reduce their drug use (Landenberger & Lipsey, 2005; Wormwith et al., 2007). On the other hand, the OUT program lasts only 30 days and there is evidence that the effectiveness of drug treatment depends on the length of the program. It would not be unexpected if a program of such short duration had little effect. The Greenlight program was a short-term program which also used cognitive-behavioral methods.

There are a variety of outcome variables that could be used to assess effectiveness. Recidivism is a commonly used outcome variable but it can refer to a number of different behaviors, including commission of a new crime, re-arrest, re-conviction, and return to jail or prison. We have chosen to use three different types of recidivism as our outcome variables, (1) any re-arrest, (2) an arrest that results in a jail term of more than 30 days, and (3) a combination of a return to prison or jail for more than 30 days.

## Methods

In order to better understand the relationship between the OUT program and recidivism rates, we chose to interview and track a group of 70 individuals who had completed the OUT program and compare them to a matched group of clients who did not participate in the OUT program. The interviews were conducted near the time when each inmate was scheduled for release. With the cooperation of the Utah County Jail, we were able to track each respondent through their first year of reentry.

### *Instruments*

An interview schedule with 72 questions was developed for the inmates who participated in the OUT program, while an interview schedule with 68 questions was used for those who were not in the OUT program. Both interview schedules used the same questions which were designed to cover 10 key categories—background information, relationships, drug use, drug treatment, drug court & probation, employment & income, self-improvement, family members,

recreation & friends, and housing, with an additional evaluation section of the OUT program for those in the treatment group. The interview schedules included both quantitative and qualitative questions.

### ***Sample***

The experimental group consisted of seventy individuals who had successfully completed the OUT program and were preparing to be released. To create our control group, we matched each individual in the experimental group with another inmate on age, gender, type of offense, and number of times they had been incarcerated. Since the OUT program is designed to help in drug rehabilitation, most of the participants in this study were serving time for drug related offenses.

### ***Interview Procedures***

At the beginning of each interview, we explained the purpose of our study and had each respondent sign a consent form. Each interview was conducted face-to-face at the Utah County Jail. The interviews were conducted from March to September of 2005 and averaged about 20 minutes.

### ***Tracking Procedures***

We tracked all of the participants at least fourteen months after release. The last of the initial interviews was conducted in September of 2005. In November of 2006 we began a systematic search of the database at the Utah County Jail to identify the total number of bookings of all participants since their release and the specific charges for each booking. Since someone on parole could be returned to prison without a formal arrest, we also checked with the Utah State Prison to determine if any of the participants had been returned to prison.

### ***Measures***

As noted earlier, we used three different measures of recidivism. The first was any re-arrest. We examined the jail records to identify the date of each re-arrest and how long each participant was in jail after each arrest.

The second measure of recidivism was any re-arrest which resulted in a stay in jail for 30 days or more. We chose this measure because we noticed that a number of offenders were re-arrested but released a short-time later, sometimes within a few days. Some of these offenders had committed relatively minor offenses or violated a probation/parole stipulation and after receiving help had no further arrests. It seemed advisable to differentiate between arrests for minor violations that resulted in short jail terms and arrests which resulted in longer stays in jail. We decided to use thirty days as the differentiating factor.

For the third measure of recidivism we combined information from the jail and prison records. If after their initial release from jail the offenders were sent to prison or had been re-arrested and spent more than 30 days in jail, they were defined as recidivists. Those who had not been returned to prison or to jail for a term of at least 30 days were coded as not being

recidivists. This measure included individuals who were back in prison even though the jail had no record of their arrest.

The major independent variable was participation in the OUT program. As noted earlier, we interviewed a total of 140 offenders—70 completed the OUT program while 70 had not completed the OUT program.

A number of control variables were included in the analysis including age, ethnic status, gender, marital status, partner status, and level of education. Ethnic status was coded as White and Non-white. Partner status was coded “1” if offenders were married or cohabiting and “0” otherwise. Education was coded on a six-point scale from less than eighth grade to having completed a college degree. We also asked the respondents the length of their sentence, the number of times they had been convicted of a felony, and if they had ever had a drug problem. From the jail records, we identified the total number of bookings of each respondent prior to their release.

Table 1 lists the descriptive statistics for each of the variables. The age of the sample ranged from 18 to 51 and 89% were males. Only 12 percent were currently married but 42% had a partner and 56% were parents. Seventy percent had graduated from high school but only one of the 140 respondents had graduated from college. Ninety-one percent identified their ethnic status as White. Their self reported length of their latest sentence ranged from one month to 3 years, with a mean of eight months. According to the jail records, the total number of bookings of the sample ranged from 1 to 62 with a mean of 10.8.

**Table 1**

**Descriptive Statistics of Variables**

Variable	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Any Rearrest	0	1	0.51	0.502
Rearrest and in jail 30 days or more	0	1	0.33	0.471
Recidivism (In jail 30+ days or prison)	0	1	0.35	0.479
OUT Program	0	1	0.50	0.502
Age	18	51	27.00	6.900
Ethnicity (0 = Non-white, 1 = White)	0	1	0.91	0.291
Gender (0 = female, 1 = male)	0	1	0.89	0.319
Children (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.56	0.499
Married (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.12	0.328
Partner (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.42	0.496
Education (1=8 years or less, 6 = BS degree)	1	6	2.95	0.825
Self report - number of felony convictions	0	30	2.36	3.510
Self report - ever had a drug problem (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0	1	0.97	0.167
Total number of bookings (jail records)	1	62	10.80	8.300
N = 140				

When matching is used rather than a true experiment, one of the concerns is whether the treatment group really is equivalent to the control group. In order to have confidence in the results, it is essential that two groups are equivalent. Table 2 provides a comparison of the OUT and non-OUT respondents on 11 different background variables. On all of the variables the two

groups were very similar; none of the differences was statistically significant.

**Table 2**

**Mean Comparison of OUT and Non-OUT Respondents on Selected Variables**

	Non-OUT	OUT
Age	27.1	27.5
Ethnicity (0 = Non-white, 1 = White)	0.91	0.90
Gender (0 = female, 1 = male)	0.89	0.89
Children (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0.56	0.56
Married (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0.11	0.13
Partner (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0.43	0.41
Education (1=8 years or less, 6 = BS degree)	2.84	3.06
Self report - length of last sentence ( in days)	237.00	261.00
Self report - number of felony convictions	2.50	2.20
Self report - ever had a drug problem (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0.97	0.97
Total number of bookings (jail records)	11.30	10.30
N = 140		

***Analysis***

The analysis proceeded in two steps. First, we compared the OUT and non-OUT groups on the three measures of recidivism. This provided an initial look to determine if there was any difference between the two. Second, we used survival analysis to estimate if there was a difference between the two groups in time from release to arrest. Survival analysis was important for two reasons. First, since the respondents were released from jail at different times, the time between release and re-arrest had to be taken into account for the comparison to be valid. Second, since the two groups were not randomly assigned, it was important to control for background variables, particularly age and number of previous offenses.

**Results**

A comparison of the OUT and non-OUT participants in recidivism is shown in Table 3. Those in the OUT program were somewhat less likely to have been rearrested, 47% compared to 54% for those not in the OUT program, although this difference was not statistically significant. However, the OUT participants were significantly less likely to have had an arrest that resulted in a jail term of more than 30 days, 26% compared to 40%, respectively. The third measure of recidivism produced similar results, 27% recidivism for the OUT participants and 42% for those not in the OUT program. Overall, the evidence suggests that those in the OUT program were less likely to have committed a serious offense that sent them back to prison or jail for an extended period of time.

**Table 3****Recidivism Comparison of OUT and Non-OUT Participants**

	Non-OUT	OUT
Age	27.1	27.5
Ethnicity (0 = Non-white, 1 = White)	0.91	0.90
Gender (0 = female, 1 = male)	0.89	0.89
Children (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0.56	0.56
Married (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0.11	0.13
Partner (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0.43	0.41
Education (1=8 years or less, 6 = BS degree)	2.84	3.06
Self report - length of last sentence ( in days)	237.00	261.00
Self report - number of felony convictions	2.50	2.20
Self report - ever had a drug problem (0 = no, 1 = yes)	0.97	0.97
Total number of bookings (jail records)	11.30	10.30
N = 140		

The results in Table 3 provide a preliminary evaluation of the OUT program. However, those results have two limitations. First, they did not control for other possible variables that could account for the differences. For example, it is possible that the Out program attracted individuals who were more motivated or with lower risk factors than those not in the OUT program. Without adequate controls it is difficult to know if the observed differences were due to the OUT program or to preexisting characteristics of the OUT participants. Second, the tabulations did not take into account exposure time. The individuals were released at different times and it is important to control for time from release until arrest or until study completion.

The appropriate technique to control for exposure time and other confounding variables is survival analysis. We used Cox regression which enabled us to determine the impact of the OUT program after controlling for exposure time and 10 control variables.

A summary of the Cox regression is shown in Table 4. The ratios listed show the influence of each variable on the odds of recidivating. In this equation we used the third measure of recidivism, the combined prison-jail time. The odds ratio for the OUT program was .54, which indicates that those who took the OUT program were 46% (1 - .54) less likely to have recidivated than those that did not take the OUT program. The importance of this statistic is that the difference occurred after controlling for 10 other variables including age and total number of bookings that occurred before participation in the OUT program.

Other than the OUT program, only two other variables were significantly related to recidivism, age and number of previous bookings. For each year increase in age the odds of recidivating decreased by 8%. The number of previous bookings was positively associated with the chance of recidivating—for each extra booking the odds of recidivating increased by 7%. None of the other variables was associated significantly with recidivism.

**Table 4**  
**Summary of Cox Regression of Recidivism by OUT Participation and Control Variables**

Predictor Variables	Odds Ratios
OUT program participation	0.536*
Age	0.915**
Total number of previous bookings	1.067**
Gender (0 = female, 1 = male)	3.070
Education (1-6)	1.040
Ethnic Status (0 = Non-white, 1 = White)	2.606
Has a partner (0 = no, 1 = yes)	1.036
Is a parent (0 = no, 1 = yes)	1.723
Length of sentence	0.999
Self report of previous drug problem (0 = no, 1 = yes)	1.248
Self report of number of previous felony convictions	0.944
N = 140	
*p < .05	
**p < .01	

## Discussion

There are several factors that may explain the success of the OUT program compared to unsuccessful programs such as the Greenlight program. First, one of the limitations of the Greenlight program was implementation (Marlowe, 2006; Rhine, Mawhorr, & Park, 2006). The OUT program is a small program that is implemented by the founder of the program and a small team of well-trained assistants. Second, McKenzie (2000) observed that effective programs are structured and focused. The OUT program has a structured curriculum and focuses on drug abuse. This focus may help account for its success.

There has been some debate about the effectiveness of cognitive-based programs. Marlowe (2006) maintained that the evidence for cognitive-behavioral programs is weak while McKenzie (2000), Landenberger & Lipsey (2005), and Wormwith et al. (2007) concluded that cognitive-behavioral programs can be effective if implemented effectively. The success of the OUT program is another piece of evidence that cognitive training programs can be effective.

Lynch (2006) suggested that we need more emphasis on theory to understand why programs do and do not work. With more refined theory, researchers and practitioners can understand what specific factors may influence reentry success. He maintained that we need to move beyond the assessment of whether a program works to a more complex understanding of what works under different conditions and for different types of offenders.

A theory that helps understand the OUT program is Cognitive Transformation Theory (Giordano, Cernkovich, & Rudolph, 2002; Maruna, 2001; Shover, 1996; Terry, 2003). According to the cognitive transformation theory of Giordano et al. (2002), there are four key elements in the desistance process. First, they hypothesized that individuals develop an openness to change—they may begin to conceive that personal change is a possibility. The OUT program appears to help individuals recognize that change is possible.

Second, individuals are exposed to particular circumstances or “hooks” that help them

move toward change. Treatment programs such as the OUT program are examples of “hooks” that may help individuals in their attempts to change.

The third element in the desistance process is the development of a conventional replacement self; parolees begin to see themselves in a different light. A key ingredient of the OUT program is helping individuals break down facades, recognize the consequences of their previous actions, and see themselves and their surroundings differently.

Finally, there is a reinterpretation of previous illegal behavior. For example, those who were previously enmeshed in the drug culture might begin to view it as something that hurts people and that they want to avoid. The OUT program helps strip individuals of previous thinking errors so they see the consequences of their behavior and reinterpret it.

Consistent with Giordano et al. (2002), Terry (2003) described desistance as a conversion process. A drug treatment program like the OUT program may provide new ideas and associations as well as reinforcement of their efforts to leave their old lifestyles and develop new self concepts. With support from treatment, some may be able to rebuild self worth, become assimilated into a different social world, and develop new associations.

Maruna (2001) also argued that desistance requires a conscious reformulation of one’s identity. After analyzing in-depth interviews of “desisters” and “persisters,” he observed that desisters tended to describe redemption narratives in which they viewed their “real selves” as non-criminals and their previous criminal behavior as the result of mistakes, bad choices, and negative influences. They differentiated themselves from their previous mistakes, crafted a moral tale from their experiences, and expressed a desire to use their experiences to help others (Maruna, 2001). The focus of the OUT program may help individuals frame this type of narrative.

In summary, cognitive transformation theorists provide a framework for understanding the desistance process. The OUT program has a number of elements that are consistent with cognitive transformation theory and this may help explain the positive results we observed.

## Summary and Conclusion

In this study we reported on a comparison of 70 jail inmates who took a cognitive-based drug treatment program with a matched group of 70 inmates who did not take the program. Fifteen percent fewer of the treatment than control group were sent back to prison or jail for more than 30 days. Using survival analysis to control for exposure time and other variables, the treatment group was almost half as likely to recidivate as the control group.

These results were unexpected and appear remarkable given that the OUT program is a short-term program given to jail inmates prior to their release. Previous research has demonstrated that length of program is associated with success and other short-term prison programs have not been effective (Wilson & Davis, 2006). We conclude that the success of the OUT program may be due to its focus, cognitive-behavioral principles, and effective implementation. The Cognitive Transformation Theory is a useful framework for understanding the OUT program and identifying principles that could be used in similar treatment programs.

Future research needs to identify more concretely the principles underlying the success of the OUT program and how they can be implemented effectively in other contexts. The lack of success of the Greelight program demonstrates how difficult it can be to implement effective

principles in specific prison bureaucracies. In addition, given the importance of aftercare (Kurlychek & Kimpinen, 2006), it may be advisable to explore an aftercare program to supplement OUT program participants after they are released from jail.

## References

- Blumstein, A., & Beck, A. J. (2005). Reentry as a transient state between liberty and recommitment. In Travis, J. & Visser, C. (Eds.), *Prison reentry and crime in America* (pp. 50-79). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bonczar, T. P. (2003). *Prevalence of imprisonment in the U.S. population, 1974-2001*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report no. NCJ 197976. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1998). Profile of Jail Inmates, 1996. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Washington, D.C., NCJ 164620.
- Giordano, P. C., Cernkovich, S. A., & Rudolph, J. A. (2002). Gender, crime, and desistance: Toward a theory of cognitive transformation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 107, 880-1064.
- Glaze, L. E. & Bonczar, T. P. (2008). *Probation and Parole in the United States, 2007 Statistical Tables*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Report No. NCJ 224707. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Greenfeld, L. A., & Balog, F. D. (1987). *Prisoners in 1986*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin NCJ 104864. Rockville, Maryland: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Healy, D., & O'Donnell, I. (2008). Calling time on crime: Motivation, generativity and agency in Irish probationers. *Probation Journal*, 55(1), 25-38.
- Kurlychek, M. & Kimpinen, C. (2006). Beyond boot camp: The impact of aftercare on offender reentry. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 5, 363-388.
- Landenberger, V. A. & Lipsey, M. W. (2005). The positive effects of cognitive behavioral programs for offenders: A meta-analysis of factors associated with effective treatment. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 1, 451-470.
- Langan, P. A., & Levin, D. J. (2002). *Recidivism of prisoners released in 1994*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report no. NCJ 193427. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Program, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Lynch, J. P. (2006). Prisoner reentry: Beyond program evaluation. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 5, 401-412.
- MacKenzie, D. L. (2000). Evidence-based corrections: Identifying what works. *Crime & Delinquency*, 46, 457-71.
- Marlowe, D. B. (2006). When "what works" never did: Dodging the "scarlet M" in correctional rehabilitation. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 5, 339-346.
- McCull, William D. (2002). Theory and practice in the Baltimore City drug court. Pp. 3-26 in Nolan, James L.(Editor) (2002). *Drug Courts in Theory and in Practice*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Maruna, S. (2001). *Making good: How ex-convicts reform and rebuild their lives*. Washington,

- DC: American Psychological Association.
- Mumola, Christopher J. and Thomas P. Bonczar. (1998). Substance abuse and treatment of adults on probation, 1995. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Washington, D.C., NCJ 166611.
- National Institute of Justice. (2000). *Annual Report 2000: Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Washington, D.C., NCJ 193013.
- Nolan, James L.(Editor) (2002). *Drug Courts in Theory and in Practice*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Pearson, F. S., Lipton, D. S., Cleland, C. M., & Yee, D. S. (2002). The effects of behavioral/cognitive-behavioral programs on recidivism. *Crime and Delinquency*, 48, 476-496
- Petersilia, J. (2003). *When prisoners come home: Parole and prison reentry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Petersilia, J. (2005). From cell to society: Who is returning home?" In J. Travis & C. Visser (Eds.), *Prison reentry and crime in America* (pp. 15-49). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pew Center on the States. (2008). *One in 100: Behind Bars in America 2008*. Washington, DC: Pew Charitable Trusts.
- Rhine, E. E., Mawhorr, T. L., & Park, E. C. (2006). Implementation: The bane of effective correctional programs. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 5, 347-358.
- Sabol, W. J., & Couture, H. (2008). *Prison inmates at midyear 2007*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Report No. NCJ 221944. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Schroeder, R. D., Giordano, P. C., & Cernkovich, S. A. (2008). Drug use and desistance processes. *Criminology*, 45, 191-222.
- Shinkfield, A. J. & Graffam, J. (2009). Community reintegration of ex-prisoners: Type and degree of change in variables influencing successful reintegration. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 53, 29-42.
- Shover, N. (1996). *Great pretenders: Pursuits and careers of persistent thieves*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Steen, S. & Opsal, T. (2007). Punishment on the installment plan: Individual-level predictors of parole revocation in four states. *Prison Journal*, 87, 344-366.
- Terry, C. M. (2003). *The fellas: Overcoming prison and addiction*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2003). *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 2003* (123<sup>rd</sup> Edition). Washington, D.C.: Bernan Press.
- Visser, C. A. (2006). Effective reentry programs. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 5, 299-302.
- West, H. C. & Sabol, W. J. (2008). *Prisoners in 2007*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin NCJ 224280. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Wilson, Doris James. (2000). Drug use, testing, and treatment in jails. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Washington, D.C., NCJ 179999.
- Wilson, J. A. and Davis, R. C. (2006). Good intentions meet hard realities: An evaluation of the Project Greenlight reentry program. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 5, 303-338.

Wormwith, J. S., Althouse, R., Simpson, M., Reitzel, L. R., Fagan, T. J., & Morgan, R. D. (2007). The rehabilitation and reintegration of offenders: The current landscape and some future directions for correctional psychology. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, 34, 879-892.