

FINAL REPORT

MONDAY COMMUNITY CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION

RSAT OUTCOME EVALUATION

Submitted to the
National Institute of Justice

September 2002

By

Jennifer A. Pealer, M.A.
Project Director

Edward J. Latessa, Ph.D
Principal Investigator

Melissa Winesburg, M.S.
Research Associate

University of Cincinnati
Division of Criminal Justice
P.O. Box 210389
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0389

This study was funded by a grant (#99-RT-VX-K025) from the National Institute of Justice. The report reflects conclusions drawn by the authors and not the National Institute of Justice

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	v
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	vi
OHIO RSAT OUTCOME EVALUATION	1
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....	1
SITE DESCRIPTION.....	3
METHODS	4
Research Design.....	4
MonDay RSAT Group.....	5
Comparison Groups.....	6
Data Collection.....	7
Process Variables Examined.....	8
Outcome Variables Examined.....	9
Analysis.....	10
RESULTS.....	11
Social Demographic Information.....	11
Current Offense and Criminal History.....	15
Drug & Alcohol History.....	18
Risk Level.....	25
Psychological & Social Functioning.....	25
Cognitive Functioning.....	27
Treatment Considerations.....	31
Intermediate Outcomes.....	41
Termination Information.....	44
Post Release Information.....	48
Performance After Termination From Treatment.....	50
Model Predicting Successful Completion.....	52
Models Predicting Arrests.....	53
Models Predicting Incarceration.....	58
Model Predicting Arrest for the MonDay RSAT Group Only.....	63
Model Predicting Incarceration for the MonDay RSAT Group Only.....	66
DISCUSSION.....	66
Limitations of Study.....	66
General Conclusions.....	68
Recommendations.....	72
REFERENCES.....	74

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics.....	12
Table 2: Social History.....	14
Table 3: Current Offense and Criminal History.....	16
Table 4: Drug History.....	23
Table 5: Descriptive Statistics for Client Self Rating for MonDay’s RSAT Group – Time 1.....	28
Table 6: Specialized Services Received While at MonDay’s RSAT Program.....	38
Table 7: Rates of Phase Advancement.....	39
Table 8: Program Violations.....	40
Table 9: Paired Sample t-tests on Client Self Rating Time 1 – Time 2.....	42
Table 10: Paired Sample t-tests on How I Think Questionnaire Time 1 – Time 2 (Includes Suspect Cases).....	45
Table 11: Termination Information.....	46
Table 12: Participation in Services During Post-Release Supervision.....	49
Table 13: Drug/Alcohol Use During Probation.....	50
Table 14: MonDay RSAT Group Status at Termination From Probation.....	51
Table 15: Percentage Arrested During the Time Period.....	52
Table 16: Percentage Incarcerated During the Time Period.....	53
Table 17: Factors Predicting Arrest.....	71
Table 18: Factors Predicting Incarceration.....	71

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Adult Substance Use Survey Results for MonDay RSAT Group.....	21
Figure 2: Level of Service Inventory Results for MonDay RSAT Group	26
Figure 3: Cognitive Distortion Scales for the MonDay RSAT Group.....	30
Figure 4: Behavioral Referent Scales for the MonDay RSAT Group.....	32
Figure 5: Summary Score for How I Think for the MonDay RSAT Group.....	33
Figure 6: MonDay Community Correctional Institution CPAI Scores Compared to Average Scores	35
Figure 7: Significant Predictors and Probabilities of Arrest (All Groups).....	55
Figure 8: Significant Predictors and Probabilities of Arrest (MonDay RSAT and Pre-TC Groups).....	57
Figure 9: Significant Predictors and Probabilities of Arrest (MonDay RSAT & MCCOP Groups).....	59
Figure 10: Significant Predictors and Probabilities of Incarceration (All Groups).....	61
Figure 11: Significant Predictors and Probabilities of Incarceration (MonDay RSAT & Pre-TC Groups).....	62
Figure 12: Significant Predictors and Probabilities of Incarceration (MonDay RSAT & MCCOP).....	64
Figure 13: Significant Predictors and Probabilities of Arrest (MonDay RSAT Group Only).....	65

Figure 14: Significant Predictors and Probabilities of Incarceration
(Monday RSAT Group Only) 67

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Data Collection Instruments

Appendix B: Descriptive Statistics

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The University of Cincinnati recognizes that this and other research reports would not be possible without the cooperation and support of program staff. Special thanks and acknowledgements go to Tracy Atkinson, Marthina Greer, Jackson Nsilulu Maria Strasser-Brady, Caroline Watson-Kramer, Jule Wright, for collecting the information on their clients, to Joan Pina for organizing the data that was sent, and to Mike Flannery and Timothy Depew for their leadership and ongoing support throughout this project. We also want to thank Candace Peters at the Ohio Office of Criminal Justice for her help and support. John Chin and Sara Simila from the Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections assisted with the outcome information for the offenders and we greatly appreciate their contribution to the report. Finally, we wish to thank all the probation officers across the state that took the time to complete the probation officer questionnaire.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The MonDay Community Correctional Institution, located in Dayton, Ohio, is a state-funded, community-based correctional facility for both male and female felony offenders. Offenders are sentenced to MonDay in lieu of prison for a period not to exceed six months. MonDay was awarded a federal grant to implement a Residential Substance Abuse Treatment program (RSAT). In conjunction with the RSAT grant, MonDay developed a therapeutic community, which was implemented by January 1998. This report presents the results of an outcome evaluation, conducted by the University of Cincinnati that compared MonDay RSAT participants from January 1998 to June 2001 to MonDay pre-TC participants from January 1991 to June 1993, and a sample of probationers who participated in substance abuse treatment from June 1990 to August 1994.

A nonequivalent comparison group design was used to conduct the outcome evaluation. The particular research design provided an opportunity to compare different treatment modalities (i.e., residential based substance abuse therapeutic community, a traditional residential based treatment which focuses on holistic programming, and an outpatient 12-step program). There were three different groups examined for this outcome evaluation – MonDay RSAT group, pre-TC group, and the MCCOP group. This outcome evaluation involves the comparison of offenders that received one of three types of treatment: 12-step outpatient treatment (MCCOP), residential substance abuse treatment (pre-TC), and a modified therapeutic community (MonDay RSAT).

MonDay RSAT Group. Offenders that entered MonDay Community Correctional between January 1, 1998 and June 30, 2001 participated in this RSAT

outcome evaluation. By January 1, 1998, MonDay had shifted treatment from a residential-based substance abuse program to a therapeutic community model. The therapeutic community model that is operated by MonDay is rooted in a social learning approach that provides opportunities for modeling and behavioral rehearsal techniques that engender self-efficacy. The treatment groups provided within MonDay incorporate a cognitive behavioral approach that aims to challenge antisocial attitudes and develop self-control. More specifically, some of the groups that are conducted at MonDay are chemical dependency education and process, relapse prevention, criminal thinking errors, anger management, problem solving, codependency, and parenting.

MonDay Community Correctional Institution Pre-TC. The first comparison group included in the present study consisted of offenders who were sent to MonDay from January 1, 1991 to June 30, 1993. During this time, MonDay attempted to make the offenders become responsible by modifying their behavior through holistic programming or treating the whole offender. The program conducted various groups such as Taking Charge, chemical dependency groups, and parenting classes. The Taking Charge group, chemical dependency groups, and the Rational Emotive Therapy group for anger management taught offenders how to plan and rehearse alternatives to problem situations through behavioral techniques.

MCCOP Participants. The other comparison group included offenders who participated in outpatient treatment – Montgomery County Chemical Offender Program (MCCOP). Offenders in this program were sentenced to a probation term in which they participated in a 12-step model changing substance abuse. Offenders who were sentenced

to probation from June 20, 1990 to August 5, 1994 and participated in the Montgomery County Chemical Offender Program were included as comparison participants.

The specific research questions that were addressed included:

What are the characteristics of the offenders being served by MonDay’s therapeutic Community RSAT program? What, if any differences, exist between the MonDay RSAT and comparison groups with regards to background characteristics?

- The MonDay RSAT and comparison groups were similar in regards to marital status, educational level, and employment status. The typical offender was single, had a 10th grade education, and was unemployed prior to arrest.
- The typical offender in the MonDay RSAT group was white, male, and was 32 years of age. The typical offender in the pre-TC group was white, male, and age 27 when they were sentenced to the MonDay pre-TC program. The typical offender in the MCCOP group was black, male, and 30 years of age. Both the MonDay RSAT group and the pre-TC group were more likely to have females than the MCCOP group.
- The majority of offenders in the MonDay RSAT and pre-TC group were serving a sentence for a felony 4 or felony 5 property or drug offense. The majority of offenders in the MCCOP group were serving a sentence for a felony 3 or 4 personal or property crime.
- The MonDay RSAT group was significantly younger the MCCOP group when they were first arrested ($\bar{x} = 19.89$ vs. $\bar{x} = 23.44$). In addition, the MonDay RSAT group had significantly less prior arrests ($\bar{x} = 3.18$) than the pre-TC group ($\bar{x} = 5.99$); however, the RSAT group had significantly more prior convictions than the MCCOP group ($\bar{x} = 2.20$ vs. $\bar{x} = 1.37$).
- The majority (91.3%) of the MonDay RSAT group scored in the “moderate” to “medium/high” risk category of the Level of Service Inventory. LSI scores were not available for the other groups.
- The MonDay RSAT group has an extensive substance abuse history. The majority of participants scored in the high-medium or high category for the following ASUS scales: involvement, disruption, social, mood, and global. Scoring in this range on these scales indicate that drug or alcohol abuse is extensive and disruptive in life functioning. The average age of first alcohol use was 13 and the average age of first drug use was 15. Furthermore, the majority of the RSAT group (81.8%) reported a history of prior drug or alcohol treatment.

- The majority of the MonDay RSAT group had high levels of anxiety, depression, risk-taking behaviors, hostility, and antisocial attitudes as measured by the Client Self Rating Form. In addition, most of the MonDay RSAT group scored in the borderline-clinical to clinical range on the cognitive distortions, behavioral referents, and overt, covert, and overall *How I Think* scales. Offenders falling into this category may exhibit eternalizing psychopathology.

What were the specific groups that offenders participated in while at MonDay? What were the rates of phase advancement? What were the rates of individual counseling? How many offenders tested positive for drugs while in the program? How many program violations did offenders experience while in the program?

- The majority of offenders in the MonDay RSAT group received a cognitive class in which their antisocial attitudes were addressed. In addition, 57 percent received anger management, 64 percent received social skills, and 42 percent received educational or vocational classes. Ninety percent received relapse prevention.¹
- MonDay has five different phases in which the offender can advance through. Ninety-eight offenders completed the orientation and phase one.² The average length of time spent in orientation was 25 days and 43 days in phase one. Ninety-seven offenders completed phase two and the average length of time was 33 days. Eighty-five offenders completed phase three in an average of 40 days. However, only 54 offenders completed phase four. The average amount of time spent in phase four was 38 days.
- There were 421 drug tests administered to 98 offenders. Sixteen tests (3.8%) were positive for drugs. The drugs that were detected were marijuana, cocaine, and opiates.
- Program violation data was only available for 56 offenders. House violations are the least serious, followed by a major violation, and a cardinal violation is the most serious. The average number of house violations was 3.88 violations. The average number of major violations was 0.23 and the average number of cardinal violations was 0.25.
- Encounters are conducted to provide a forum for dealing with conflict between family members and to establish accountability. Sixty-one offenders were encountered at least once while at MonDay. Forty-four offenders were encountered twice and eleven offenders were encountered three times.

¹ Data were not available for the 90 participants that were part of the RSAT Process evaluation.

² Data were only available for 98 participants. Again, information on the 90 participants in the RSAT process evaluation was not available.

What are the changes in the offenders' level of psychological and social functioning? What are the changes in the offenders' cognitive distortions? What were the completion rates among RSAT participants?

- Paired sample t-tests revealed a significant difference between the time 1 and time 2 score for the following Client Self-Rating scales: anxiety, depression, risk-taking, hostility, self-esteem, decision-making, and self-efficacy. Participation in MonDay's RSAT program significantly reduced the offenders' levels of anxiety, depression, risk-taking, and hostility while increasing self-esteem, decision-making, and self-efficacy.
- Participation in MonDay's RSAT program significantly reduced the offenders' cognitive distortions as measured by the *How I Think* Questionnaire. For example, the cognitive distortions of self-centeredness, blaming others, minimizing, and assuming the worst were reduced. The behavioral referents of oppositional/defiance, physical aggression, lying, and stealing were reduced. In addition, the summary scores for overt and covert behaviors along with the overall *How I Think* scale was significantly reduced by participation in the RSAT program.
- All offenders in all groups were released at the time of termination of the project. In addition, the majority of offenders in the MonDay RSAT group (87.6%) and the pre-TC group (87.3%) were successfully released. Twenty-nine percent of the offenders in the MCCOP group were successfully released.
- The average length of time spent in treatment was 169 days for the MonDay RSAT group and 126 days for the pre-TC group. (Length of time spent in treatment was not available for the MCCOP group.)
- A logistic regression model was calculated to determine which factors predict successful completion of treatment for MonDay's therapeutic community RSAT program. There were no significant predictors of successful program completion, which is not surprising given that completion of MonDay is based on time. MonDay's RSAT program can only provide services to offenders for 180 days.

What are the rates of new arrests after termination? What are the rates of new incarcerations after termination? What factors are associated with post-release performance?

- Approximately 35.8 percent of the MonDay RSAT group was arrested within one year after termination whereas 32.4 percent of the pre-TC was arrested and 26.3 percent of the MCCOP group was arrested within the same time period. Only 7.1

percent of the MonDay RSAT group was arrested one to two years after release whereas 12.4 percent of the pre-TC group and 13.5 percent of the MCCOP group was arrested during this time period. There were no offenders in the MonDay RSAT group arrested during 2 to 3.8 years after termination but 10.4 percent of the pre-TC group and 9.0 percent of the MCCOP group was arrested 2 to 3.8 years after release.

- Twenty percent of the RSAT group was incarcerated within one year after release. Twenty-five percent of the pre-TC was incarcerated and 23.7 percent of the MCCOP group was incarcerated during the same time period. Only 6.6 percent of the MonDay RSAT group was incarcerated one to two years after release from the program whereas 13 percent of the pre-TC and 10.7 percent of the MCCOP group was incarcerated during this time period. There were no offenders that were incarcerated during the time period of 2 to 3.8 years.
- Logistic regression models were calculated to determine what factors predict arrest. Age and number of prior arrests were significant predictors in all models predicting arrest. Younger offenders and offenders with more prior arrests in all groups were more likely to be arrested. Race was a significant predictor in two models – all groups predicting arrest and MonDay RSAT and pre-TC groups predicting arrest. Nonwhites were more likely than whites to be arrested. The group variable was not a significant predictor in any model predicting arrest. However, the coefficient was negative in all models. Thus, participation in MonDay’s RSAT program reduced the probability of arrest when compared to the other treatment modalities. However, the reduction was not statistically significant.
- Logistic regression models were calculated to determine what factors predict incarceration. When examining all groups and the MonDay RSAT and the pre-TC groups, nonwhites were more likely to be incarcerated when compared to whites. Gender was a significant predictor in two models. Males were more likely to be incarcerated after termination from the programs. Age was a significant predictor in one model – MonDay RSAT and pre-TC groups predicting incarceration. Younger offenders were more likely to be incarcerated than older offenders. Number of prior convictions was a significant predictor in the model MonDay RSAT and MCCOP groups predicting incarceration. Offenders with more prior convictions were more likely to be incarcerated. Participants in the MonDay RSAT group was less likely to be incarcerated in all models, but the reduction in the probability of incarceration was not statistically significant.

The conclusions of this outcome evaluation are limited by the amount of missing data for the comparison groups on some variables. For example, LSI data were not available for the comparison group. This is an important limitation, since it appears that

the MonDay RSAT program has made a conscious effort to limit the program to moderate and high-risk offenders. This may not have been true for the pre-TC or the MCCOP group. In addition, the study was unable to control for services received after termination from the program. This type of information was not known for the comparison group and for less than half of the MonDay RSAT group.

Another limitation of the study was that random assignment to groups was not possible. Random assignment to groups would have allowed the groups to be very similar. Instead, the study made comparisons between non-equivalent groups. This is a common problem in correctional research; nonetheless, the study had to use statistical rather than design control.

A third limitation is the time difference between the MCCOP and the pre-TC groups and the MonDay RSAT group. Changes in court and sentencing practices and other external factors can affect offender outcome rates. Thus, we were unable to control for these powerful influences on recidivism rates.

The current study had an average follow-up period of 31 months after the offender left the program. The amount of time “at risk” may not be long enough to adequately assess the long-term effects of MonDay’s RSAT program.

The following are offered based on the findings of the outcome evaluation:

1. MonDay should continue the therapeutic community approach. The results report that participation in MonDay’s RSAT program reduced the probability of being arrested or incarcerated when compared to the participants in the traditional residential treatment (pre-TC) and the outpatient treatment (MCCOP). However, the reductions were not statistically significant.

2. MonDay should develop completion criteria that are not time-based. Completion of treatment should be based on acquisition of pro-social attitudes and behaviors and not length of time. The results revealed that cognitive distortions were significantly correlated with outcome. Thus, completion should be centered on eliminating the cognitive distortions.
3. Research has shown that aftercare is an important component of therapeutic communities (Knight, Simpson, and Hiller, 1999; Wexler, Melnick, Lowe, and Peters, 1999). Accordingly, MonDay should strengthen the aftercare component. It is important that offenders released from MonDay receive high quality aftercare services that address their needs.
4. MonDay should continue to collect data that would enable the outcome study to continue. The current study was limited in the amount of follow-up time to track the offender. However, if MonDay continues the study, research can further examine the long-term effects of the therapeutic community RSAT programs.

OHIO RSAT OUTCOME EVALUATION

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The “war of drugs” has created numerous problems for the criminal justice system: courts are backlogged with drug offenders and prisons are strained with their increasing rate of imprisonment. It is estimated that, within the criminal justice system, seven out of ten men and eight out of ten women are drug users (Lipton, 1998). Recognizing the link between continued drug use and recidivism, state and local agencies are searching for the most effective way of treating this challenging correctional population. The Residential Substance Abuse Treatment programs funded by Subtitle U of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 offer a promising avenue for treating drug offenders.

Residential substance abuse treatment has its roots in the therapeutic community movement of the 1950s. Synanon, the first therapeutic community, was established by Dederich in 1958 and emerged out of the self-help movement (Brook and Whitehead, 1980). It is estimated that nearly one-third of all therapeutic communities today are based upon the traditional Synanon programs (DeLeon, 1990a). These traditional programs are highly structured and organized, and treatment lasts from one to three years (Sandhu, 1981). Because drug use is seen as a symptom of a larger personality disorder, traditional TCs are designed to restructure the personality of the offender through encounter group therapy and a focus on occupational improvements. The “community” of drug offenders is seen as the primary agent of change (DeLeon and Ziegenfuss, 1986). Recently modified versions of the traditional TC have emerged which combine the self-help approach and cognitive-behavioral approaches (e.g., relapse prevention) commonly used by mental health professionals.

Research has revealed mixed results for both community-based and prison-based TCs. Several studies of community-based TCs have demonstrated a reduction in criminal behavior and substance abuse and an improvement in employment and other prosocial behaviors (Knight, Simpson, and Hiller, 1999; Wexler, Melnick, Lowe, and Peters, 1999; Wexler, 1995). Overall, the research on therapeutic communities suggests that program completion and length of stay in treatment are the most significant factors in predicting success (usually measured as no involvement in criminal activity and abstinence from drugs) (Simpson, 1984; DeLeon and Rosenthal, 1979; Faupel, 1981; DeLeon, 1990b). The research on TCs is not without criticisms. Inciardi, Martin, Butzin, Hooper, and Harrison (1997) identified four criticisms of TC research. First, a lack of multivariate designs makes it difficult to disentangle the effects of individual characteristic and the effects of treatment, leaving us with little information about factors that are predictors of relapse or recidivism. Second, most studies have not incorporated multiple outcome criteria to measure program success. Third, as with most correctional research, the follow-up time frames have been inadequate. Fourth, the comparison groups used often fail to account for important differences between groups that are likely to influence program outcome. Relatedly, the use of treatment comparison groups is often misleading since members of these groups are likely to have received some kind of treatment. Another common shortcoming in TC research is the insufficient attention that is given to the measurement of program quality (Faupel, 1981; Moon and Latessa, 1994).

This outcome study was designed to compensate for these flaws in research design. In addition, this study attempted to explore the “black box” of treatment in order to identify those factors that are most associated with success and to facilitate the replication of effective

residential substance abuse treatment programs. The current study overcame these criticisms by: using two measures of outcome – arrest and incarceration, having a longer follow-up period (up to 3.8 years), and using comparison groups which receive treatment and those which receive minimal treatment.

SITE DESCRIPTION

This report contains data from an outcome evaluation conducted on the MonDay Community Correctional Institution. MonDay, located in Dayton, Ohio has been in operation for over 20 years. It is funded by the State of Ohio and governed by local judicial boards. The total capacity of the facility is 124 offenders. Both male and female offenders are sentenced to MonDay in lieu of prison for a period not to exceed six months.

In October 1997, MonDay was awarded a federal grant for the purpose of implementing a Residential Substance Abuse Treatment Program. Offenders identified as needing long-term residential treatment are now assigned to RSAT for a period of six months. In conjunction with the RSAT grant, MonDay developed a Therapeutic Community, which was fully implemented by January 1, 1998. The MonDay RSAT program participated in an outcome evaluation that was funded by the National Institute of Justice. This evaluation compared those who participated in MonDay's TC to offenders who were sentenced to MonDay before it became a therapeutic community and to a group of offenders sentenced to probation to determine whether participation in MonDay's TC was associated with differences in outcome.

METHODS

Research Design

This project used a non-equivalent comparison group design in order to compare three different types of treatment modalities. The first group (MonDay RSAT group) was a residential substance abuse treatment program, the second group (MonDay's pre-TC) was a traditional residential treatment program and the third group (Montgomery County Chemical Offender Program) was an outpatient drug treatment program³. Thus, this outcome evaluation compares MonDay's RSAT treatment to two other treatment groups to estimate the impact of MonDay's Residential Substance Abuse Treatment (RSAT) program on future criminal involvement. Random assignment to groups was not possible; however, comparison group cases were matched by race, age, and gender.

Because of programmatic changes that occurred at MonDay, two comparison groups were used in this study. The first comparison group was those who participated in MonDay Community Correctional Institution from January 1991 to June 1993. During this time, the treatment modality at MonDay was a traditional residential treatment program, which included a holistic approach to changing behavior. The program had groups that were targeting criminogenic needs and groups that were targeting non-criminogenic needs such as hygiene and self-esteem. The second comparison group used for this study was a group of offenders who participated in the Montgomery County Chemical Offender Program (MCCOP). These offenders were sentenced to probation. A total of 226 participants were in the treatment group and 377 cases were in the comparison groups. The MonDay pre-TC

³ Participation in MonDay's treatment group was voluntary. If the facility identified a need and the offender agreed to treatment, then the offender could be placed in the TC. Furthermore, participation in the evaluation of MonDay's treatment was completely voluntary. There were no repercussions if the offender refused to participate.

group was comprised of 244 participants and the MCCOP group was comprised of 133 participants.

MonDay RSAT Group

Offenders that entered MonDay Community Correctional between January 1, 1998 and June 30, 2001 participated in this RSAT outcome evaluation. By January 1, 1998, MonDay had shifted treatment from a residential-based substance abuse program to a therapeutic community model. The therapeutic community model that is operated by MonDay is rooted in a social learning approach that provides opportunities for modeling and behavioral rehearsal techniques that engender self-efficacy. The treatment groups provided within MonDay incorporate a cognitive behavioral approach that aims to challenge antisocial attitudes and develop self-control. More specifically, some of the groups that are conducted at MonDay are chemical dependency education and process, relapse prevention, criminal thinking errors, anger management, problem solving, codependency, and parenting.

In addition, to the groups, offenders may also work on obtaining their GED or seek and obtain employment. MonDay has also adopted much of the language of a therapeutic community. For example, offenders participate in encounter groups in which a member is confronted about behavior in front of his/her peers. The encounter group is designed to make the offender see how his/her behavior affects the community and how his/her attitudes, thoughts, and value systems affect his/her behavior. In addition to group therapy and employment/GED classes, offenders participate in morning and evening meetings and meet for individual counseling sessions with their case manager.

Comparison Groups

MonDay Community Correctional Institution Pre-TC. The first comparison group included in the present study consisted of offenders who were sent to MonDay from January 1, 1991 to June 30, 1993. During this time, MonDay attempted to make the offenders become responsible by modifying their behavior through holistic programming or treating the whole offender. The program conducted various groups such as Taking Charge, chemical dependency groups, and parenting classes. The Taking Charge group, chemical dependency groups, and the Rational Emotive Therapy group for anger management taught offenders how to plan and rehearse alternatives to problem situations through behavioral techniques.

MCCOP Participants. The other comparison group included offenders who participated in the Montgomery County Chemical Offender Program (MCCOP). Offenders in this program were either sentenced a probation term in which they participated in a 12-step model changing substance abuse. Offenders who were sentenced to probation from June 20, 1990 to August 5, 1994 and participated in the Montgomery County Chemical Offender Program were included as comparison participants.

Thus, this study involves the comparison of offenders that received one of three types of treatment: 12-step treatment (MCCOP), residential substance abuse treatment (pre-TC), and a modified therapeutic community (MonDay RSAT). The difference in treatment between RSAT therapeutic community and the residential program (pre-TC) was the influence of the family. It is the family's responsibility to identify thinking errors and confront the particular family member. In addition, the TC model was based on a social learning model whereas the residential program was more of an eclectic model.

Data Collection

As part of the RSAT project, the University of Cincinnati created an automated database to assist programs with data collection and provide a mechanism for reporting results. The RSAT database was installed at the University. MonDay personnel collected the data from offenders and case notes and UC staff entered the data into the automated database. The data consisted of: demographics, offense and disposition, prior criminal history, drug use and history, risk level, program phases and advancement, type of treatment, program violations, drug screens, treatment outcome, and pre and post assessments. The site also provided agency-specific assessment information on each offender (e.g., Level of Service Inventory). Data forms were checked periodically to ensure the quality of the data. Recidivism data were collected by UC staff through written surveys of parole officers and offenders during December 2001 and January 2002.⁴

In addition to quantitative data for measuring program processes, the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI, Gendreau & Andrews, 1994) was used as a measure of program integrity. The CPAI provides a standardized, objective way for assessing the quality of correctional programming against empirically based standards. The CPAI is designed to ascertain how well the program is meeting the principles of effective intervention. There are six primary sections of the CPAI: program implementation, client pre-service assessment, program characteristics, staff characteristics, evaluation, and other. Each section of the CPAI consists of 6 to 26 items with a total of 77 items. Each of these items is scored as “0” or “1.” For an item to be scored “1”, the program must demonstrate that it has meet the specified criteria. Each section is scored as either “very satisfactory”

⁴ Follow-up questionnaires were sent to parole officers and MonDay participants. However, only four follow-up questionnaires were returned by the offenders. Therefore, follow-up information will be reported from the parole officers only.

(70% to 100%); “satisfactory” (69% to 60%); “needs improvement” (59% to 50%); or “unsatisfactory” (less than 50%). The overall total and score is summed across the six sections and the same scale is used in determining the overall assessment. Data for the CPAI are gathered through structured interviews with program staff. Other sources of information include examination of program documentation, review of case files, and observation of program activities. Upon conclusion of the assessment, a report is written which details the program strengths and areas that need improvement.

Research using the CPAI has shown it to be a significant predictor of arrest and incarceration (Holsinger, 1999). Offenders who participate in programs where there was low program integrity (as measured by the CPAI) were significantly more likely to recidivate (e.g., be arrested and/or incarcerated). Furthermore, other researchers have found support for the concepts that comprise the CPAI (Antonowicz & Ross, 1994).

Process Variables Examined

There were four main categories of process variables examined including offender characteristics, nature of services provided, termination data, and post-release treatment and supervision.

Offender characteristics. The standardized intake form (see Appendix B) was used to collect basic demographic information such as age, gender, race, marital status, number of dependents, years of education, and employment status prior to arrest. Additional information was also collected which included: criminal history and substance abuse history.

Supplemental information that was collected on offender characteristics included: the offenders’ level of psychological and social functioning as measured by the Client Self-Rating Form (see Appendix A); their level of cognitive distortions as measured by the *How I*

Think Questionnaire (see Appendix A); their risk of recidivism and major problem areas as measured by the Level of Service Inventory (LSI); and their severity of substance abuse problem as measured by the Adult Substance Use Survey (ASUS).

Nature of services provided. The service tracking form (see Appendix A) was used to collect information on the nature of services available at MonDay. The information collected included: participation in groups, length of time in each phase, number of encounters, length of individual counseling sessions, and number and type of program violations. Additional information from the CPAI⁵ and the schedule of activities were used as indicators of the services provided.

Termination data. The information collected regarding the offenders' termination from MonDay included type of termination (successful or unsuccessful) and criminal justice placement and residency upon termination (See Appendix A).

Post release treatment and supervision. Data collection instruments were developed to gather general information from parole officers regarding each offender's treatment and supervision activities during the period of supervision after release from the program. A data collection instrument was sent to an offender who provided an address to gather information on educational progress, employment and family situation, peer groups, and criminal involvement and drug usage after release from the program.

Outcome Variables Examined

There were two main categories of outcome variables examined including intermediate outcomes and longer-term outcomes.

⁵ Information from the CPAI included the specific groups and interventions that were being offered to everyone.

Intermediate outcomes. Intermediate outcomes that were examined included changes in offenders' psychological and social functioning as measured by the re-administration of the Client Self-Rating form and changes in the offenders' level of cognitive distortions as measured by the re-administration of the *How I Think* Questionnaire.

Long-term outcomes. The current evaluation tracked offenders in all groups up to 3.8 years after they were released from MonDay or MCCOP. The outcome variables that were examined included several measures of substance abuse relapse and recidivism. Relapse was measured as new substance use (yes or no), and as the type and frequency of use throughout the follow-up period.⁶ Recidivism was defined as new arrest (yes or no) and any new period of incarceration (yes or no).

Analysis

This study examines the differences among the RSAT participants and comparison group members along a variety of measures. In some instances, data for the comparison groups were not available. When this was the case, only the treatment data were presented. This study will examine multiple outcome measures for the RSAT participants and comparison cases. Chi-square, ttests, and analysis of variance tests were conducted to examine the differences between groups and logistic regression was used to estimate the probability of rearrest.

Logistic regression was used to estimate the probability of arrest and new incarceration after incarceration. The purpose of the logistic regression is two-fold. First, a logistic regression model identifies the significant predictors of the outcome – arrest or new incarceration. Second, logistic regression controls for differences between the groups.

⁶ This information was reported by probation officers and was available for the treatment group only.

Accordingly, variables that are significantly different will be included into the model in order to control for these differences. The variables chosen for the logistic regression included: race, gender, marital status, completion of 12th grade, age, number of prior arrest, number of prior convictions, and group.⁷ These variables were chosen for three reasons: 1) they were correlated at the bivariate level with the outcomes; 2) they were included as control variables because there were significant differences between the groups; or 3) previous research has shown that the variable was a significant predictor of outcome.

RESULTS

Social demographic data were collected in order to describe the RSAT participants and comparison groups and to investigate whether differences in outcome were related to differences within the three samples. By knowing the types of offender MonDay served, we determined whether outcome was influenced by any of these demographic factors. This section profiles the groups based on demographic characteristics such as age, race, gender, educational level and performance, employment and criminal history. Specifically, this section will address the following questions:

- **What are the characteristics of the offenders served by the MonDay Community Correctional Institution TC?**
- **What differences exist between the treatment and comparison groups with regards to background characteristics?**

Social Demographic Information

Table 1 compares the three groups on race, age, gender, and marital status. With regard to race, the majority of offenders in both the MonDay RSAT and pre-TC group were

⁷ The number of prior arrests was included in the models predicting arrests. The number of prior convictions was included in the models predicting incarceration.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics

Characteristics	MonDay RSAT (N= 226)		Pre-TC (N=244)		MCCOP (N=133)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Race:						
White	135	60.8	128	53.1	60	48.4
Black	82	36.9	107	44.4	64	51.6
Other	5	2.3	6	2.5	0	0.0
$\chi^2 = 9.620; p = .047$						
Gender:						
Male	152	67.3	160	65.8	110	82.7
Female	74	32.7	83	34.2	23	17.3
$\chi^2 = 13.057; p = .001$						
Age at Intake:						
18 to 20	26	11.8	50	21.3	18	14.9
21 to 25	34	15.5	64	27.2	26	21.5
26 to 30	34	15.5	58	24.7	24	19.8
31 to 35	51	23.2	43	18.3	22	18.2
36 to 40	41	18.1	13	5.5	14	11.6
41 to 45	18	8.2	6	2.6	8	6.6
46 to 50	10	4.5	1	0.4	5	4.1
51 to 59	6	2.7	0	0.0	4	3.3
Mean	32.30		27.03		30.94	
$F = 26.924; p = .000$						
Marital Status:						
Married	39	17.6	45	18.9	24	18.2
Single	183	82.4	193	81.1	108	81.8

MonDay pre-TC participants January 1990 – June 1993
 N's may not equal total due to missing data

white whereas the majority of offenders in the MCCOP group were black. Chi-square analysis revealed that the MonDay RSAT participants were more likely to be white whereas the MCCOP participants were the least likely to be white. Concerning gender, the majority of offenders were males in all three groups. However, it appears that the pre-TC group was more likely to have females whereas the MCCOP group was more likely to have males. Analysis of variance test reveal that there were statistically significant differences regarding the average age of the participants in all three groups: MonDay RSAT group (\bar{x} =32.30), pre-TC comparison group (\bar{x} =27.03), MCCOP group (\bar{x} =30.94). Thus, it appeared that the MonDay RSAT group was significantly older than the pre-TC group. For marital status, a chi-square analysis revealed that there were no statistically significant differences between the groups. A clear majority of offenders in all three groups were single at the time of placement in the programs.

Table 2 shows the participants' educational level and employment status upon intake. Concerning educational level, all three groups were very similar. The average grade level that had been completed ranged from 10.38 (MonDay RSAT) to 10.72 (MCCOP). An analysis of variance test revealed no significant differences between the educational levels of the three groups.

The majority of offenders in all three groups were unemployed prior to being arrested. Sixty-seven percent of offenders in the MonDay RSAT group and the MCCOP group were unemployed at the time of their arrest whereas sixty-four percent of offenders in the pre-TC group were unemployed at the time of their arrest. These differences are not statistically significant.

Table 2: Social History

Characteristics	MonDay RSAT (N= 226)		Pre-TC (N=244)		MCCOP (N = 133)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Highest Grade Completed:						
9 th grade or less	51	24.8	50	20.9	27	20.5
10 th grade	39	18.9	50	20.9	30	22.7
11 th grade	45	21.8	58	24.3	26	19.7
12 th grade	48	23.3	68	28.2	41	31.1
Some college or higher	23	11.2	13	5.4	8	6.1
Mean	10.38		10.68		10.72	
Employment Status Prior to Arrest:						
Employed full-time or part-time	83	38.2	79	35.3	40	32.8
Unemployed	134	67.2	145	64.7	82	67.2

MonDay pre-TC participants January 1990 – June 1993

NA = Information not reported

Current Offense and Criminal History

Table 3 reports the offenders' current offense and criminal history. For the MonDay RSAT group and the pre-TC, it appears that offenders mostly committed a property crime or a drug crime that resulted in their placement in MonDay. For the MCCOP group, offenders were charged with a property crime (43.2%), a drug crime (24.6%) or a personal crime (22.9%). Chi-square analysis revealed that there were significant differences between the groups. It appears that the MCCOP group was more likely to be charged with a personal crime whereas the MonDay RSAT group was less likely to be charged with a property crime. It also appears that the MonDay RSAT group was more likely to be charged with a drug crime.

Regarding the level of adjudication, participants in all three groups were more likely to be adjudicated for less serious offenses (Felony level 4 and 5). However, it appears that the MonDay RSAT group was less likely to be charged with a more serious (Felony 1 and Felony 2) offense than either the pre-TC or the MCCOP participants.

Additionally, on average, the participants in the MonDay RSAT group and the pre-TC group had their first arrest at the age of 19. However, the MCCOP participants were older when they had their first arrest ($\bar{x} = 23.44$). An analysis of variance test indicated that the MonDay RSAT group was significantly younger than the MCCOP group when they were first arrested.

Information was also available on the number of prior felony convictions and number of sentences to community supervision. For prior felony convictions, on average, the MonDay RSAT group had significantly more prior felony convictions than the MCCOP

Table 3: Current Offense and Criminal History

Variable	MonDay RSAT (N= 226)		Pre-TC (N=244)		MCCOP (N=133)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Crime Type:						
Personal	17	7.5	33	15.3	27	22.9
Property	96	52.9	82	38.0	51	43.2
Drug	99	43.8	88	40.7	29	24.6
Other	14	6.2	13	6.0	11	9.3
$\chi^2 = 23.929; p = .001$						
Level of Adjudication:						
Felony 1	6	2.7	7	3.3	13	10.2
Felony 2	11	4.9	17	8.1	15	11.8
Felony 3	34	15.0	53	25.4	27	21.3
Felony 4	58	25.7	132	63.2	72	56.7
Felony 5	117	51.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
$\chi^2 = 232.534; p = .000$						
Age at First Arrest:						
16 or younger	75	41.9	68	29.3	24	20.5
17 to 18	25	14.0	54	23.3	16	13.7
19 to 25	44	24.6	70	30.2	42	35.9
26 to 30	15	8.4	25	10.8	16	13.7
31 to 40	17	9.5	11	4.7	12	10.3
41 or older	3	1.3	4	1.7	7	6.0
Mean	$\bar{x} = 19.89$		$\bar{x} = 19.99$		$\bar{x} = 23.44$	
$F = 10.461; p = .000$						

MonDay pre-TC participants January 1990 – June 1993

Table 3: Current Offense and Criminal History (continued)

Variable	MonDay RSAT (N= 226)		Pre-TC (N=244)		MCCOP (N=133)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Prior Sentences to Community Supervision:						
0	44	20.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
1	71	33.3	99	41.8	61	48.0
2	50	23.5	64	27.0	35	27.6
3	23	10.8	42	17.7	21	16.5
4 or more	25	11.7	32	13.5	10	7.9
Mean	$\bar{x} = 1.99$		$\bar{x} = 2.18$		$\bar{x} = 1.27$	
F = .703; p = .496						
Prior Arrests:						
0	27	13.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1 to 2	88	42.3	62	25.6	48	36.6
3 to 4	49	23.6	61	25.2	39	29.7
5 or more	44	21.1	119	49.2	44	33.7
Mean	$\bar{x} = 3.18$		$\bar{x} = 5.99$		$\bar{x} = 4.77$	
F = 20.779; p = .000						
Prior Convictions:						
0	38	20.2	33	21.0	55	49.5
1 to 2	89	47.3	88	56.1	36	32.4
3 to 4	32	17.0	24	15.3	10	9.0
5 or more	29	15.4	12	7.6	10	9.0
Mean	$\bar{x} = 2.20$		$\bar{x} = 1.86$		$\bar{x} = 1.37$	
F = 5.609; p = .004						

MonDay pre-TC participants January 1990 – June 1993

group but not the pre-TC group. The MonDay RSAT group had 2.20 prior felony convictions compared to 1.86 for the pre-TC group and 1.37 prior felony convictions for MCCOP.

Concerning the number of prior sentences to community supervision. The pre-TC group, on average, had the most prior sentences to community supervision ($\bar{x} = 2.18$) followed by the MonDay RSAT group with 1.99 prior sentences and the MCCOP group with 1.27 prior sentences to community supervision. These differences are not statistically significant. Interestingly, twenty percent of the MonDay RSAT group did not have a prior sentence to community supervision whereas 41.8 percent of the pre-TC and 48 percent of the MCCOP group had at least one prior sentence to community supervision.

Drug & Alcohol History

Offenders entering MonDay's RSAT program are assessed using the Adult Substance Abuse Survey (ASUS) (Wanberg, 1997). The ASUS provides a global measure of disruption in life functioning that is attributable to drug/alcohol use and several subscales that measure lifetime involvement in drugs, problems and consequences of drug use, antisocial behavior and attitudes, psychological and emotional disruption, and defensiveness. The scales are normed against adult criminal justice samples ranging in size from 602 to 645 offenders. Cronbach's alpha for the global scale and for each of the subscales range from .75 to .95 for these populations. Following are detailed descriptions of each of the subscales. Information on the ASUS scales was available for 192 offenders (90%) in the MonDay RSAT group.⁸ Table B1 in Appendix shows the statistics for the ASUS for the MonDay RSAT group.

ASUS Involvement Scale. This scale measures lifetime involvement in drugs from ten different drug categories. It also measures the type and frequency of drug use during the

⁸ ASUS assessment instrument was not administered to the pre-TC group or the MCCOP group because MonDay did not use this assessment during that particular time period.

three-month period prior to incarceration. A high score on this scale could reflect two different behaviors: 1) the offender is endorsing high scores for several drugs; or 2) offender is endorsing lower scores across many drugs. The MonDay RSAT group had an average scale score of 18.41 indicating a high degree of involvement.

ASUS Disruption Scale. This scale measures the negative consequences of drug use including loss of control over behavior, psychological and physiological dysfunction, and problems at home, work, and school. The disruption scale is the best measure of drug abuse and dependency within the ASUS. The MonDay RSAT group scored an average of 41.01 on this scale, which indicates that the majority of offenders were in the high range for disruption.

ASUS Social Scale. This scale measures the past and present antisocial behaviors and attitudes including illegal behavior, acting out behavior in adolescence, aggressive behavior, and rebellious attitudes. A high score on this scale may reflect two different instances: 1) offenders who are resistant to treatment; or 2) offenders that are self-disclosing which is seen as being a positive first step in involvement in treatment. The average score for this scale for the treatment group was 14.09. This score indicates that the majority of offenders were in the high-medium range of the ASUS social scale.

ASUS Mood Scale. This scale measures a single dimension of psychological and emotional disruption. High scores on this scale mean that the offender is experiencing depression, worry, anxiety, irritability, anger, feelings of not wanting to live, and being unable to control emotions and uncontrolled acting out behavior. The average score for the mood scale was 12.49, which signifies that most offenders were in the high category for mood scale.

ASUS Defensive Scale. The defensive scale provides a measure of the offender's ability to self-disclose sensitive information. High scores on this scale indicate a high degree of defensiveness and an inability to divulge personal information. The average score for this scale was 5.53. Thus; the majority of offenders fell into the low-medium category for the defensive scale.


ASUS Global Scale. The involvement, disruption, social, and mood scales are summed to provide a global measure of disruption and risk associated with substance abuse. Higher scores indicate a more severe degree of overall disruption of life functioning. The average score on this scale was 86.49, which means that the majority of offenders were classified in the high category for the global scale.

Scores on the ASUS scales can also be categorized into low, low-medium, high-medium, or high range for each scale. Figure 1 provides the percentage of offenders that fell into these categories for each of the ASUS subscales.⁹ The majority of offenders were categorized as high for all ASUS subscales and the global scale except the defensive scale. Thus, it appears that the offenders in the treatment group have a high degree of involvement with drugs to the detriment of their behavior at home, school, work (disruption), to the detriment of their emotional well being (mood), and impacts their antisocial behavior resulting in aggression. However, it also appears that the MonDay RSAT group is willing to self-disclose (defensive), which may facilitate the treatment process.

Drug History. Participants in the RSAT study were also asked a variety of questions related to their drug and alcohol use (data concerning drug and alcohol use and previous substance abuse treatment were not available for the comparison group). With regard to age

⁹ The ASUS can also be described according to deciles. Figure B1 through Figure B5 in Appendix B provide the percentage of offenders that fell within each decile.

Figure 1: Adult Substance Use Survey Results for MonDay RSAT Group



at first use, the average age of first alcohol use for the MonDay RSAT group was 13.63 (Table 4). The mean age for first drug use for the MonDay RSAT group was 15.03

With regard to primary drug of choice, chi-square analysis reveals significant differences between the three groups as to their drug of choice. The drug of choice for the MonDay RSAT group was crack (23.1%) followed by alcohol (19%) and then marijuana (18.1%). The drug of choice for the pre-TC group was taking multiple drugs at once or having multiple favorites (46.8%) followed by crack (21.8%) and then marijuana (14.8%). The drug of choice for the MCCOP participants was crack (41.4%) followed by multiple favorites (26.3%) and then alcohol (17.2%). It appears that the pre-TC group was more likely to have multiple favorites whereas the MCCOP group favored crack and the MonDay RSAT group was more likely to favor heroin.

In addition to having a substance abuse problem, some offenders also have been diagnosed with a mental health problem. Almost 17 percent of the offenders in the MonDay RSAT group had been dual diagnosed with a mental health problem and a drug problem. It also appears that the majority of offenders in the RSAT group (77.2%) had a family member with a substance abuse problem. The offenders who participated in MonDay's therapeutic community also had a history of prior treatment. The majority of offenders reported having participated in treatment prior to their stay at MonDay (81.8%). When examining what types of treatment the offenders have participated in, it is clear that the majority have participated in outpatient treatment (57.2%) followed by short-term (less than 30 days) (51.1%) and long-term (more than 30 days) residential treatment (46.1%).

Table 4: Drug History

Variable	MonDay RSAT (N= 226)		Pre-TC (N=244)		MCCOP (N=133)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Age at First Alcohol Use:						
10 and under	36	16.9		NA		NA
11 to 12	37	17.4		NA		NA
13 to 15	85	39.9		NA		NA
16 to 17	35	16.4		NA		NA
18 or older	20	9.4				
Mean	13.63			NA		NA
Age at First Drug Use:						
10 and under	12	5.6		NA		NA
11 to 12	36	16.9		NA		NA
13 to 15	91	42.7		NA		NA
16 to 17	43	20.2		NA		NA
18 or older	31	14.6				
Mean	15.03			NA		NA
First Drug of Choice:						
Heroin	34	15.7	6	2.8	3	3.0
Non-crack cocaine	35	16.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
Crack	50	23.1	47	21.8	41	41.4
Marijuana	39	18.1	32	14.8	12	12.1
Alcohol	41	19.0	24	11.1	17	17.2
Other	17	7.9	6	2.8	0	0.0
Multiple ¹⁰	0	0.0	101	46.8	99	26.3

MonDay pre-TC participants January 1990 – June 1993

NA = Information not available

¹⁰ The treatment participants were not asked about multiple drugs.

Table 4: Drug History (continued)

Variable	MonDay RSAT (N= 226)		Pre-TC (N=244)		MCCOP (N=133)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Dual Diagnosis:						
Yes	34	16.7		NA		NA
No	169	83.3		NA		NA
History of Family Substance Abuse:						
Yes	166	77.2		NA		NA
No	49	22.8		NA		NA
History of Prior Treatment:						
Yes	180	81.8		NA		NA
No	40	18.2		NA		NA
Type of Prior Treatment:						
Detoxification	41	22.8		NA		NA
Methadone Maintenance	15	8.3		NA		NA
Outpatient	103	57.2		NA		NA
Short-term inpatient	92	51.1		NA		NA
Long-term residential	83	46.1		NA		NA

MonDay pre-TC participants January 1990 – June 1993

NA = Information not available

Risk Level


Upon admission to MonDay, an offenders' risk level is assessed with the Level of Service Inventory (LSI, Andrews & Bonta, 1995). The LSI is an objective and quantifiable assessment instrument that examines both static and dynamic risk factors that are associated with recidivism. These factors include: criminal history, family circumstance, employment/education achievements, peer relationships, substance abuse, leisure/recreation, personality characteristics, and antisocial attitudes. The LSI has been shown to be highly predictive of recidivism. Past reliability studies have revealed alpha coefficients ranging from .64 to .90. A total score is also provided that indicates the overall level of risk of recidivism. Depending on their total scores, offenders can be classified as "low," "low/moderate," "moderate," "medium/high," or "high" risk.

LSI data were available for 218 participants (92.3%) in the MonDay RSAT group. Total LSI scores of 41-54 are considered very high for recidivism; scores of 34-40 are considered medium/high risk for recidivism; scores of 24-33 are considered moderate risk of recidivism; scores of 14-23 are considered low/moderate risk of recidivism; and scores of 0-13 are considered low risk of recidivism. When examining the overall score, the majority of the offenders in all groups scored as either "moderate" or "medium/high" risk for recidivism (Figure 2). Table B2 in Appendix B reports the descriptive statistics of the LSI scores for the MonDay RSAT group. The higher the score for the subcomponent, the more of a risk/need factor it is for the offender.

Psychological and Social Functioning

Psychological and social factors such as depression, anxiety, risk-taking, antisocial values, and hostility have been found to be positively related to substance abusing behaviors

Figure 2: Level of Service Inventory Results for MonDay RSAT Group



Mean = 30.35

and longevity and success in treatment while factors such as self-esteem, self-efficacy, and decision-making ability have been found to be negatively associated with substance abusing behaviors and longevity and success in treatment (Simpson and Knight, 1998). Therefore, these areas are all potential targets for treatment. Theoretically, therapy should reduce individuals' levels of anxiety, depression, risk-taking, hostility, and antisocial values, and increase their self-esteem, self-efficacy, decision-making ability, desire for help, and treatment readiness.

The Client Self-Rating form (Simpson and Knight, 1998) was used as a measure of offender's level of psychological and social functioning. Clients were to be assessed at intake and termination from MonDay. Intake information was available for 207 offenders (91.6%) who participated in MonDay's therapeutic community treatment (Client Self-Rating information was not available for the comparison groups). Table 5 reports the descriptive statistics for the subscales of the Client Self-Rating instrument. Higher scores reflect a higher level of anxiety, depression, self-esteem, decision-making, risk-taking, hostility, self-efficacy, antisocial attitudes, desire for help, and treatment readiness.¹¹

Cognitive Functioning

Cognitive distortions are inaccurate ways of attending to or conferring meaning upon experiences (Barriga, Gibbs, Potter, & Liao, 1999). Research has indicated that cognitive distortions may contribute to antisocial or criminal behavior (Yochelson and Samenow, 1976). Using the *How I Think* questionnaire (Barriga, et al., 1999), offenders' cognitive distortions were assessed. Four self-serving cognitive distortions were examined: self-

¹¹ Table B3 in Appendix B includes the reliabilities for all pre and post scales for the Client Self Rating. The reliabilities ranged from a low of .4650 for the self-efficacy scale to a high of .8270 for the decision-making scale.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics for Client Self Rating for MonDay’s RSAT Group – Time 1

MonDay RSAT (N= 226)					
Scale	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Anxiety (range 7-35)	201	7.00	35.00	21.84	5.50
Depression (range 6-30)	199	6.00	28.00	17.51	4.06
Self-esteem (range 6-30)	200	6.00	29.00	16.70	4.15
Decision-making (range 9-45)	200	9.00	43.00	29.65	5.63
Risk-taking (range 7-35)	197	12.00	35.00	22.54	4.48
Hostility (range 8-40)	202	8.00	38.00	21.19	5.89
Self-efficacy (range 7-35)	200	14.00	35.00	24.04	4.47
Antisocial Attitudes (range 5-25)	118	5.00	22.00	12.96	3.25
Desire for Help (range 7-35)	83	9.00	35.00	27.16	5.37
Treatment Readiness (range 8-40)	84	15.00	40.00	28.17	5.38

centered (according such status to one’s own views that the opinions of others are not considered), blaming others (misattributing blame to outside sources), minimizing/mislabeling (believing that antisocial behavior is acceptable, admirable, or causes no real harm), and assuming the worst (assuming that improvement is impossible, or considering a worst case scenario). The *How I Think* questionnaire also depicts four behavioral referents scales that are manifested from the cognitive distortions:

opposition/defiance, physical aggression, lying, and stealing. From these subscales, three summary scores can be computed. The overt scale is computed by averaging the opposition/defiance and physical aggression means. The covert scale is computed by averaging the lying and stealing means. The overall *How I Think* score is computed by averaging the means of all eight subscales. Higher scores indicate higher levels of cognitive distortions.¹²


The *How I Think* Questionnaire was administered at intake and termination for the MonDay RSAT group only. Data from the *How I Think* questionnaire were available for 88 offenders in the MonDay RSAT group. The questionnaire has an anomalous responding scale that determines the truthfulness of the answers. Scores higher than 4.25 are considered invalid and should not be used in data analyses. Scores greater than 4.0 but less than or equal to 4.25 are considered “suspect” and interpreted with caution. Thus, intake data were available for 59 cases of which 14 cases may be considered “suspect.”¹³

One way to analyze the scales of the *How I Think* questionnaire is to determine which of the three ranges (non-clinical, borderline-clinical, clinical) the score falls into. The ranges on the eight subscales can be used to provide a fine-grained analysis of the offenders. As Figure 3 reveals, the majority of offenders fell into the “clinical” range on the self-centered, blaming others, and minimizing/mislabeling scales, whereas the majority of offenders fell into the “non-clinical” range on the assuming the worst scale. Thus, these offenders can be described as having a strong egocentric bias and a need for treatment that addresses their

¹² Table B4 in Appendix B includes the reliabilities for all scales for the *How I Think* Questionnaire. The reliabilities ranged from a low of .6665 for the lying scale to a high of .9310 for the *How I Think* overall scale.

¹³ The *How I Think* Questionnaire was implemented at MonDay starting February 2001. Therefore, only 136 offenders should have the *How I Think* Questionnaire. However, some offenders did not complete the full instrument and data was available for 88 offenders of which 26 assessments could not be used because the AR score was greater than 4.26.

Figure 3. Cognitive Distortion Scales for the MonDay RSAT Group*



*Offenders scoring 4.25 or lower on the Anomalous Response Scale. Offenders were placed in the classifications based on which third of the scale their scores fell within. Higher scores indicate a problem in the cognitive distortion measured.

externalization and minimizing the consequences of their actions. Figure 4 shows the behavioral referent scales. The majority of offenders fell into the “clinical” range for the oppositional defiant, physical aggression, lying, and stealing behavioral referents. Therefore, the majority of offenders in MonDay not only had cognitive distortions, the majority manifested the distortions into behaviors. Concerning the summary scores for the covert, overt and overall *How I Think*, the majority of offenders fell into the “clinical” range (Figure 5).


According to Barriga et al. (1999), offenders falling into the “borderline-clinical” and “clinical” range for the *How I Think* scale may exhibit externalizing psychopathology. Offenders in the “borderline-clinical” and “clinical” ranges in the overt scale may exhibit antisocial behavior that typically involves confrontation with the victims, whereas these ranges for the covert scale indicate non-confrontational antisocial behavior (for complete descriptive statistics for the *How I Think* subscales, see Table B5 in Appendix B).

Treatment Considerations

Outcome evaluations are enhanced when the researcher is able to determine what happened to the client while under supervision. This may include documenting whether a participant moved to different phases based on progress and the outcome of treatment. The purpose of this section is to identify the general services provided by MonDay’s RSAT program and the rates of phase advancement. In addition, this section will address behavior while in the RSAT program. In-program behavior, as measured by violations and drug testing, can have a significant impact on behavioral change. The specific research questions addressed where:


- **What were the specific groups that offenders participated in while at MonDay?**

Figure 4. Behavioral Referents for the MonDay RSAT Group*



*Offenders scoring 4.25 or lower on the Anomalous Response Scale. Offenders were placed in the classifications based on which third of the scale their scores fell within. Higher scores indicate a problem in the behavioral referent measured.

Figure 5. Summary Score for How I Think for the MonDay RSAT Group*



*Offenders scoring 4.25 or lower on the Anomalous Response Scale. Offenders were placed in the classifications based on which third of the scale their scores fell within. Higher scores indicate a problem in the summary score measured.


What were the rates of phase advancements?

- **What were the rates of individual counseling?**
- **How many offenders tested positive for drugs while in the program?**
- **How many program violations did offenders experience while in the program?**

General Services Provided. MonDay Community Correctional Institution currently operates a therapeutic community that is currently rooted in a social learning approach that provides opportunities for modeling and behavioral rehearsal techniques. The Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI) was conducted on MonDay during both modalities of treatment. As indicated in the first section of this report, the CPAI is a tool designed to ascertain how well a program is meeting certain principles of effective intervention (Gendreau & Andrews, 1994). Programs receive an overall score and a score for each of the six sections of the CPAI with less than 50 percent considered “unsatisfactory,” 50 percent to 59 percent considered “needs improvement,” 60 percent to 69 percent considered “satisfactory,” and 70 percent to 100 percent considered “very satisfactory.” The average overall CPAI score for over 200 programs across the United States is 53.4; MonDay’s pre-TC holistic program model scored 56 percent, whereas MonDay’s therapeutic community program scored 74.2 percent (Figure 6).

The most recent CPAI score for MonDay reveals that there were changes within the six components of the assessment. MonDay’s score increased in all six areas: implementation, assessment, treatment, staff, evaluation, and other. However, the scores increased in the evaluation and other section partly because of participation in the process and outcome evaluation currently taking place. In addition, the overall score for MonDay increased from 56 percent (pre-TC model) to 74.2 percent (TC) model. It is important to note

Figure 6. Monday Community Correctional Institution CPAI Scores Compared to Average Scores*



*The average scores are based on 245 CPAI results across a wide range of programs. Very Satisfactory=70% or higher; Satisfactory=60-69%; Needs Improvement=50-59%; Unsatisfactory=less than 50%.

that the number of items on the CPAI increased to 77 items from 65 items to 75 items. Thus, MonDay has made dramatic improvement in program integrity from the 1st assessment to the 2nd assessment.

The following are areas in which improvement was made from the first CPAI to the second CPAI:

- Before implementation of the therapeutic community, there was an extensive literature review conducted and a formal pilot period. In addition, the overall model of the therapeutic community is rooted in the social learning approach.
- The program has implemented a standardized and objective risk and need instrument – the Level of Service Inventory (LSI). In addition, the program has adopted the Adult Substance Abuse Survey (ASUS) to assess offenders’ substance abuse.
- The program targets more criminogenic needs than non-criminogenic needs. In addition, the program is rooted in a model that research has shown to be effective in treating offenders – the social learning model.
- New staff are hired on personal qualities that are related to skills related to service delivery.
- Staff currently receive a yearly evaluation on clinical skills related to service delivery.
- MonDay has begun to gather reconviction data on offenders six months or more after leaving the program.
- A reassessment of the offender’s risk and need level is conducted using the LSI.
- There has been a formal evaluation that included a comparison group conducted on MonDay.
- MonDay has developed ethical guidelines that include an ethics of intervention (e.g., least intrusive methods).

The following are items in which there needed to be improvement after the second CPAI:

- The program director is not systematically involved in the delivery of direct services to offenders.
- Even though offenders are assessed with the Multidimensional Additions and Personality Profile (MAPP), this information is not available to the treatment staff.

- Offenders are not consistently trained to identify and monitor problem situations throughout the program. Furthermore, offenders are not taught to rehearse alternative, prosocial ways of coping with these situations.
- Punishers are more commonly used than rewards. In addition, some of the punishers used are “shaming” techniques in which the effectiveness of these types of punishers is questionable. Furthermore, staff are not trained in the administration of rewards and punishers. In addition, the rewards that are used are built into the system of phases and are not tied directly to behavior while in the program.
- Completion criteria should be in place. The completion of the program should not be based on time, rather, completion should be based on the acquisition of pro-social skills.
- Although MonDay staff set up aftercare services, they have no control over whether these services are received.
- The initial training of new staff is limited to on the job training.

Quantitative information concerning the specific types of interventions that MonDay’s RSAT participants receive is available for 100 individuals.¹⁴ As Table 6 reveals, the majority of participants received anger management classes (57%). In addition, ninety participants received some kind of cognitive intervention (Thinking for a Change or Criminal Thinking in which offenders identify thinking errors). Social skills included classes such as: parenting, budgeting, and communication skills. Sixty-four percent of offenders participated in these services. While at MonDay, 42 percent of the RSAT participants participated in GED classes and/or job readiness classes. Lastly, ninety offenders participated in relapse prevention groups.

¹⁴ Information on specific interventions for the 90 cases that were part of the RSAT Process evaluation was not collected.

Table 6: Specialized Services Received While in MonDay’s RSAT Program

Service	Number Receiving	Percentage
Anger Management:		
Yes	57	57.0
No	43	43.0
Cognitive Class:		
Yes	90	90.0
No	10	10.0
Social Skills:		
Yes	64	64.0
No	36	36.0
Education/Vocational:		
Yes	42	42.0
No	58	58.0
Relapse Prevention:		
Yes	90	90.0
No	10	10.0

Rates of Phase Advancement. There are five phases that offenders can advance through while at MonDay. Due to missing information, rates of phase advancement were available for only 98 offenders (43% of the offenders that were discharged). Table 7 reports the rates of phase advancements. Only 54 offenders finished all five phases of treatment.¹⁵ The average length of time spent in the orientation phase was 25.21 days whereas the average length of days spent in phase one was 43.53. For phase two, the average number of days spent was 33.80, and the offenders spent an average of 40.46 days in phase three. Offenders spent 38.93 days in the last phase – phase four.

¹⁵ Offenders may not have finished treatment due to early release or their sentence was finished before they had completed all five phases of treatment.

Table 7: Rates of Phase Advancement

Phase	Number Completing	Minimum Days in Phase	Maximum Days in Phase	Average Time in Phase
Orientation	98	3	53	25.21
Phase 1	98	12	95	43.53
Phase 2	97	13	103	33.80
Phase 3	85	8	95	40.46
Phase 4	54	1	69	38.93

Rates of Individual Counseling. Information on the number of individual counseling sessions was available for 68 cases. The number of sessions ranged from one session to sixteen individual sessions. Of these sessions, the minimum amount of time spent with the offenders was five minutes while the maximum amount of time spent during a single session was two hours and fifteen minutes. In total, the offenders received an average of 314.15 minutes of individual counseling across all sessions (Table B6 in Appendix B for complete statistics).

Drug Testing. Ninety-eight offenders were drug tested at least one time during their stay at MonDay. Out of 98 offenders, there were 421 drug tests administered in all. Only 3.8 percent of the drug tests (16 tests) were positive for drugs. The drugs that were detected included: marijuana, cocaine, amphetamines, and opiates.

Program Violations. MonDay utilizes three different types of violations: house violations, major violations, and cardinal violations. House violations are the least serious and may include such behavior as: unauthorized items, failure to respond to wake-up calls, smoking in unauthorized areas, and failure to follow regularly scheduled appointments. Major violations may include such behavior as: aggressive behavior, destruction of property, stealing, gambling, and possession of unauthorized drugs. A cardinal violation is the most

serious and may include the following types of behavior: physical violence, possession of a controlled substance, drug use, and noncompliance with staff instructions.

Program violation data was available for 56 offenders or 24.8 percent of the terminated offenders (Table 8). The average number of house violations was 3.88 violations. The average number of cardinal violations was 0.25 and the average number of major violations was 0.23. In some instances, the type of violation was not known. There were eleven cases in which the type of violation was known. The mean number of unknown violations was 57.09. All three types of violations and the unknown violation were added to obtain the total number of violations. Data was computed for 56 offenders. The mean number of total violations was 15.57 violations per offenders.

Table 8: Program Violations

Violation Type	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
House	56	0	39	3.88	7.18
Cardinal	56	0	3	0.25	0.55
Major	56	0	3	0.23	0.54
Unknown	11	2	199	57.09	58.97
Total Violations	56	1	199	15.57	33.26

Encounters. The primary purpose of the encounter group is to provide a forum for dealing with conflict between members that allow for free expression of feelings and establish accountability for one member to another for their actions. In addition, encounter groups allow members to identify and label feelings, gain a deeper level of honesty, and learn to resolve conflict. Sixty-one offenders were encountered at least once while at MonDay.

Forty-four offenders were encountered at least twice while at MonDay, and eleven offenders were encountered three times while participating in MonDay.¹⁶

Intermediate Outcomes

Intermediate objectives are the effects that are attained through receiving the treatment such as reducing the offenders' levels of psychological and social functioning, and cognitive distortions. The specific research questions addressed were:

- **What are the changes in the offenders' level of psychological and social functioning?**
- **What are the changes in the offenders' cognitive distortions?**
- **What were the completion rates among RSAT participants?**

Psychological and Social Functioning. The Client Self-Rating form, designed to measure psychological and social factors such as depression, anxiety, risk-taking, antisocial values, and hostility, was administered at intake and termination. The instrument was administered at intake on 204 cases (90.3%) and administered at termination on 149 cases.¹⁷

The data presented is information from the MonDay RSAT group.

According to Simpson and Knight (1998), treatment should reduce anxiety, depression, risk-taking and hostility and increase self-esteem, self-efficacy, decision-making, desire for help, and treatment readiness. Paired sample *t*-tests between time 1 and time 2 scores on the Client Self-Rating reveal statistically significant changes in the anxiety, depression, self-esteem, decision-making, risk-taking, hostility, and self-efficacy scales (Table 9). All significant changes were in the expected direction. More specifically,

¹⁶ The encounter process includes encountering others and in turn being encountered. It is important to remember that offenders may have encountered others without being encountered themselves. However, the data presented only included those that were encountered and not general participation in encounters.

¹⁷ Some offenders refused to participate in the exit evaluation upon termination from MonDay's RSAT program.

Table 9: Paired Sample t-tests on Client Self-Rating Time 1- Time 2*

Scale	No. of Pairs	Time 1 Mean	Time 2 Mean	t-value	Sig
Anxiety (range 7-35)	145	21.72	17.86	8.113	.000
Depression (range 6-30)	142	17.60	13.65	10.448	.000
Self-esteem (range 6-30)	143	16.79	20.71	-9.302	.000
Decision-making (range 9-45)	143	29.60	34.36	-8.722	.000
Risk-taking (range 7-35)	147	22.29	20.50	3.911	.000
Hostility (range 8-40)	148	20.91	19.53	2.844	.005
Self-efficacy (range 7-35)	146	24.09	26.30	-5.685	.000
Antisocial Attitudes (range 5-25)	76	13.20	12.37	1.925	.058
Desire for Help (range 7-35)	57	25.82	26.93	-1.221	.227
Treatment Readiness (range 8-40)	57	27.58	29.05	-1.509	.137

* includes all time

participation in MonDay's therapeutic community RSAT program decreased the offenders' levels of anxiety, depression, risk-taking, and hostility and increased their levels of self-esteem, decision-making, and self-efficacy. There were no statistically significant changes in the offenders' antisocial attitudes, desire for help, or treatment readiness levels. However, the change in these scales was in the expected direction. For example, treatment reduced the

antisocial attitudes and increased the offenders' desire for help and treatment readiness; however, the changes were not statistically significant.

The null findings for the desire for help and treatment readiness scales may indicate that on average, MonDay's participants were motivated for treatment and had a desire for help when they entered the program. The average intake scores for these scales indicated that there were a medium to high degree of treatment readiness and desire for help upon admission into the RSAT program.

Monday's RSAT program is a six-month program. However, the length of time between the different measures varied and the average number of days between the administration of the instrument was 149.58 days. To determine if amount of time affected the outcome for the time 2 score, regression analyses were conducted.¹⁸ Time was a significant predictor for four of the significant relationship – depression, self-esteem, decision-making, and self-efficacy (see Table B7 in Appendix B). As the amount of time (measured in days) increased, the score on the time 2 measures of self-esteem, decision-making, and self-efficacy increased suggesting that longer stays in treatment contributed to higher self-esteem and self-efficacy and better decision-making skills. As the amount of time increased, the score on the time 2 measure of depression decreased suggesting that the longer offenders stayed at MonDay the less depressed they were.

Cognitive Distortions. Offenders' cognitive distortions such as self-centered, blaming others, minimizing behavior, and assuming the worst were measured by the *How I Think* Questionnaire. The questionnaire was administered at intake and termination from the program. The instrument was administered to 88 offenders at intake and to 72 offenders at

¹⁸ Correlations were conducted between amount of time and the differences between the time 1 and time 2 scores for all scales. The only statistically significant correlations found between time and the differences in the time 1 and time 2 score was for self-esteem and self-efficacy.

termination.¹⁹ The *How I Think* Questionnaire has an anomalous response scale that indicates untruthful answering by the individual. Scores greater than 4.25 are not to be included in the analysis and were removed. Therefore, the maximum number of cases available to compare time 1 and time 2 scores was 29. However, due to missing data, some scales may not have 27 pairs. The questionnaire was not administered to the pre-TC or the MCCOP group; hence, the data presented is for the MonDay RSAT group only.

According to Barriga et al. (1999), higher scores on the scales indicate higher levels of cognitive distortions and are associated with criminogenic behavior. Thus, treatment programs can reduce the likelihood of antisocial/criminal behavior by reducing offenders' cognitive distortions. A comparison of means tests between all (i.e., including suspect cases—anomalous response scores greater than 4.0 but less than 4.26) time 1 and time 2 scores on the *How I Think* Questionnaire reveals statistically significant changes on all scales of the *How I Think* Questionnaire. Specifically, participation in MonDay's therapeutic community RSAT program reduced the offenders' levels of self-centeredness, blaming others, minimizing, assuming the worst, defiance, physical aggression, lying, and stealing (Table 10). In addition, treatment reduced the summary scores for the covert and overt behaviors and the overall *How I Think* scale.

Termination Information

Of those discharged from Monday's RSAT therapeutic community, eighty-seven percent had been successfully discharged, seven percent were unsuccessfully terminated, and 5.3 percent were terminated either due to early release, or transfer to another institution (Table 11). Termination information is available for 237 offenders in the pre-TC group; the

¹⁹ Some offenders refused to complete the exit assessments including the *How I Think* Questionnaire.

Table 10: Paired Sample t-tests on *How I Think* Questionnaire, Time 1- Time 2*

Scale	No. of Pairs	Time 1 Mean	Time 2 Mean	t-value	Sig
Cognitive Distortions					
Self-centered (range 0-6)	27	3.62	3.02	4.52	.000
Blaming Others (range 0-6)	27	3.54	3.10	3.53	.002
Minimizing/Mislabeling (range 0-6)	26	4.61	4.25	3.92	.001
Assuming the Worst (range 0-6)	28	2.94	2.53	2.80	.009
Behavioral Referents					
Opposition-Defiance (range 0-6)	27	3.64	3.11	4.79	.000
Physical Aggression (range 0-6)	29	3.74	3.24	3.90	.001
Lying (range 0-6)	26	3.79	3.39	2.78	.010
Stealing (range 0-6)	27	3.44	3.06	3.00	.006
Summary Scores					
Covert (range 1-6)	26	3.63	3.24	3.21	.004
Overt (range 1-6)	27	3.70	3.17	4.64	.000
How I Think (range 1-6)	26	3.69	3.22	4.13	.000

* Includes the scores that may be considered “suspect” because the AR scale is greater than 4.0 but less than 4.25.

Table 11: Termination Information

Variable	MonDay RSAT (N= 226)		Pre-TC (N=244)		MCCOP (N=133)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Case Status at Time of Data Collection:						
Successfully discharged	198	87.6	207	87.3	44	33.6
Unsuccessfully discharged	16	7.1	17	7.2	38	29.0
Other	12	5.3	13	5.5	49	37.4
$\chi^2 = 164.083; p = .000$						
Continued Drug Treatment:						
Yes	147	90.2	NA		NA	
No	16	9.8	NA		NA	
Living Arrangements Upon Discharge:						
With family/relative	110	58.2	NA		NA	
With friends	13	6.9	NA		NA	
By himself/herself	5	2.6	NA		NA	
Group home	1	0.5	NA		NA	
Halfway house	29	15.3	NA		NA	
Other	31	16.4	NA		NA	
Criminal Justice Placement Upon Discharge:						
Probation	173	90.6	NA		NA	
Parole	3	1.6	NA		NA	
Jail	13	6.8	NA		NA	
Prison	2	1.0	NA		NA	

MonDay Pre-TC participants January 1991 – June 1993

NA = Information not reported

N's may not equal total due to missing data

majority of which were successfully terminated (87.3%). Seven percent were unsuccessfully discharged and 5.5 percent were discharged for other reasons. For the MCCOP group, 33.6 percent were successfully discharged, 29 percent were unsuccessfully terminated, and 37.4 percent were discharged for other reasons. Chi-square analysis revealed that there were significant differences between the groups. More specifically, the MonDay RSAT group was more likely to be successfully discharged, whereas the MCCOP group was more likely to be unsuccessfully terminated.

Of those offenders who had been discharged from MonDay RSAT program, an overwhelming majority (90.2%) was to continue receiving additional drug or alcohol treatment. At discharge from MonDay, the majority of the MonDay RSAT group was living with a family member (58.2%) followed by a halfway house placement (15.3%) or with friends (6.9%). Additionally, most of the MonDay RSAT group (90.6%) was placed on probation when discharged from MonDay whereas 6.8 percent were placed in jail and 1.6 percent and 1.0 percent were placed in parole and prison respectively. (Information on continued drug treatment, living arrangements, and criminal justice placement was not available for the comparison groups.)

An independent sample t-test revealed that there was a significant difference between the lengths of time spent in MonDay. On average, the MonDay RSAT participants spent a longer amount of time in treatment (169.21 days) when compared to MonDay's pre-TC group (126.93 days).²⁰

²⁰ See Table B8 in Appendix B for complete statistics on length of stay in treatment.

Post Release Information

Reporting Status. To determine what kinds of treatment the offenders received after they left MonDay's RSAT program, surveys were sent to the agencies responsible for supervision of MonDay offenders after termination. Of the 226 offenders that were discharged from MonDay, only 61 (27%) probation officer reports are available.²¹ Table 12 reports the types of services the offenders received while on probation. The majority of offenders (63.1%) had to report to their officer at least twice a month. Sixty-four percent of the offenders received some type of drug and alcohol treatment. The majority (57%) of the substance abuse treatment was classified as being as "other" and included mostly Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) and Narcotics Anonymous (NA). Offenders also received other types of services besides substance abuse treatment. More specifically, the following types of treatment/services were received after the offenders left MonDay: almost 51 percent of the offenders received educational or vocational services; 45 percent received employment services; 32.7 percent received some kind of mental health treatment. Additional services included: domestic violence and counseling.

At the time of data collection, 26 offenders (74.3%) were not actively in treatment whereas nine offenders (25.7%) were still actively involved in treatment services. Of the 26 offenders that were inactive, the majority (53.8%) had been successfully terminated from treatment.

Drug/Alcohol Use During Probation. Table 13 reports the offenders' involvement in drug and alcohol use during the probation period. Five offenders (11.6%) reported or were detected using alcohol while on probation, whereas sixteen offenders (34%) were reported or

²¹ Agency information was collected from MonDay files at termination from the program. Surveys were sent to the probation officers to be completed. Only 61 surveys were returned to the University.

Table 12: Participation in Services During Post-Release Supervision

Variable	N	Percentage
Reporting Status:		
Once a week or more	17	44.7
Bi-weekly	7	18.4
Once a month	11	28.9
Less than once a month	3	7.9
Drug/Alcohol Services Received:		
Yes	35	64.8
No	19	35.2
Type of Service Received:		
Residential	8	9.5
Intensive Outpatient	5	6.0
Standard Outpatient	12	14.3
Other	59	70.2
Other Services Received:		
AA	34	26.9
Educational/Vocational	3	50.9
Employment	9	45.1
Mental Health	9	32.7
Domestic Violence	2	5.5
Family/Marital Counseling	2	4.7
Treatment Status:		
Active	9	25.7
Inactive	26	74.3
Type of Termination from Treatment:		
Successful	14	53.8
Unsuccessful	12	46.2

detected using drugs during the supervision period. Cocaine, which was detected the most, was found 63.2 percent of the time followed by heroin (detected 21.1% of the time) and marijuana (detected 15.8% of the time).

Table 13: Drug/Alcohol Use During Probation

Variable	N	Percentage
Reported/Detected Alcohol Use:		
Yes	5	11.6
No	38	88.4
Reported/Detected Drug Use:		
Yes	16	34.0
No	31	66.0
Number of Times Used Drugs:		
1	6	42.9
2	4	28.6
3	1	7.1
4 or more	3	23.3
Type of Drug Used:		
Marijuana	3	15.8
Cocaine	12	63.2
Opiates	4	21.1

Termination Status From Probation. At the time of termination from probation, 24 offenders (33.8%) were employed either full-time or part-time whereas two offenders (4.3%) were enrolled in school (Table 14). Twenty-one offenders (44.7%) were unemployed at the time of termination from probation. Regarding termination status from probation, twenty offenders (32.8%) were still active at the time of termination. Of those who had been terminated, eight offenders (13.1%) successfully completed probation and 54.1 percent were terminated unsuccessfully.

Performance After Termination from Treatment

Arrest Information. Information regarding new arrests was provided by the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. Due to different levels of follow-up, time was

Table 14: MonDay RSAT Group Status at Termination From Probation

Variable	N	Percentage
Employment Status at Termination:		
Unemployed	21	44.7
Student	2	4.3
Employed	24	51.0
Termination from Probation:		
Successful	8	13.1
Unsuccessful	33	54.1
Active	20	32.8
Type of Unsuccessful Termination		
Abscond	3	9.1
Revocation	21	63.6
Other	9	27.2

divided up into three categories: one year or less, one to two years, and two or more years.

Table 15 reports the percentage of offenders within all three groups that were arrested during the specified time period.²² As reported in Table 15, a larger number of MonDay RSAT participants (35.8%) were arrested within the first year than either the pre-TC group (32.4%) or the MCCOP group (26.3%). Chi-square analysis revealed that the difference was not statistically significant. Examining the time period from one to two years, the MonDay RSAT group (7.1%) was less likely to be arrested compared to the pre-TC group (12.4%) and the MCCOP group (13.5%). Again, the difference was not statistically significant. The pre-TC group (10.4%) was more likely to be arrested after two years when compared to the MonDay RSAT group (0%) and the MCCOP group (9.0%).

²² The longest period of time the offenders in the treatment group were “at risk” in the community was 1401 days (3.8 years). Therefore, the time “at risk” in the community (i.e., the amount of time in which they could be arrested or incarcerated) was examined up to 1401 days.

Table 15: Percentage Arrested During the Time Period

Time Period	MonDay RSAT (N= 226)		MonDay Pre-TC (N=244)		MCCOP (N=133)		Significance Level
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1 year or less	35.8%	(N = 81)	32.4%	(N = 78)	26.3%	(N = 35)	.176
1 to 2 years	7.1%	(N = 16)	12.4%	(N = 30)	13.5%	(N = 18)	.082
2 years or more	0.0%	(N = 0)	10.4%	(N = 25)	9.0%	(N = 12)	.000

N's = the number of people arrested during the time period.

Incarceration Information. Information on new incarceration was available for all offenders through the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. As Table 16 revealed, the percentage of offenders being incarcerated was lower for the MonDay RSAT group than for the comparison groups for both time periods; however, the differences were not statistically significant. For example, only 20.4 percent of the MonDay RSAT group was incarcerated within one year or less from termination from the program whereas 25.4 percent of the pre-TC was incarcerated and 23.7 percent of the MCCOP group was incarcerated during the same time period. When examining the time period of one to two years, the MonDay RSAT group was the least likely to be incarcerated (6.6%) followed by the MCCOP group (10.7%) and the pre-TC group (13.0%). Again, these differences were not significant.²³

Model Predicting Successful Completion

A logistic regression model was computed to determine what factors predict if an offender was going to successfully complete the MonDay therapeutic community RSAT program. Six variables were included into the model to predict successful completion: race,

²³ There were no offenders incarcerated for the time period 2 years or more.

Table 16: Percentage Incarcerated During the Time Period

Time Period	MonDay RSAT (N= 226)		MonDay Pre-TC (N=244)		MCCOP (N=133)		Significance Level
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1 year or less	20.4 %	(N = 46)	25.1%	(N = 60)	23.7%	(N = 31)	.467
1 to 2 years	6.6%	(N = 15)	13.0%	(N = 31)	10.7%	(N = 14)	.074

N's = the number of people incarcerated during the time period.

age at placement, gender, marital status, age at 1st arrest, and LSI score.²⁴ There were no significant predictors of successful program completion. The insignificant findings are not surprising given the high base rate of successful completion (87.6% of the MonDay RSAT group successfully completed the program). In addition to the high base rate, the CPAI results for MonDay indicate that program completion was based on the length of time of the offenders' sentences and not on acquiring prosocial behavior. Offenders are released from MonDay once they serve 180 days regardless of whether or not they have made progress in treatment.²⁵

Models Predicting Arrests

In order to determine what factors were significant in predicting which offenders would be arrested, several logistic regression analysis were calculated. For each model, the dependent variable was any new arrest. For example, the first model shows what factors are significant in predicting arrest examining all the groups together. The second model reveals what factors predict arrest examining the MonDay RSAT group and the pre-TC group. The last model predicts arrest when examining the MonDay RSAT group and the MCCOP group.

²⁴ These variables were chose for 3 possible reasons: 1) they were correlated with the type of termination at the bivariate level; 2) they were differences with the treatment based on these characteristics; or 3) previous research has determined that they were significant predictors of program completion.

²⁵ Table B9 in Appendix B reports the results of the logistic regression analysis.

The variables that were entered into the model and their codings are presented in Table B10 in Appendix B.

Logistic regressions calculate beta coefficients for each predictor entered into the model, assuming all other factors in the model are being held constant. Doing this allows for the power and significance of each factor on its own to be revealed. In brief, the variables entered into each model included race, age (in years), gender, marital status, completion of 12th grade, number of prior arrests, number of prior convictions, and which group the participants were placed in.²⁶ Table B11 through Table B13 (see Appendix B) show the actual coefficients with their significance levels for each regression calculated in these analyses.

All Groups Predicting Arrest. The first analysis examined the ability of all groups to predict whether an offender was arrested after termination from the programs. There were three significant factors in the logistic regression predicting arrest; race, age, and number of arrests. More specifically, nonwhites, males, younger offenders, and those with more arrests, were significantly more likely to be arrested after termination from the programs. The coefficient for the group variable was negative indicating that offenders in the MonDay RSAT group was less likely to be arrested after termination when compared to offenders in the pre-TC and the MCCOP groups, however, this difference was not statistically significant.²⁷


Figure 7 reports the probabilities of being arrested. Whites had a 47 percent chance of being arrested whereas nonwhites had a 61 percent chance of being arrested. Offenders who

The number of prior arrests was used in the models to predict and the number of prior convictions was used in the models to predict incarceration.

²⁷ Offenders who participated in the MonDay RSAT group had a 46 percent chance of being arrested whereas offenders in the comparison groups had a 47 percent chance of being rearrested.

Figure 7. Significant Predictors and Probabilities of Arrest

All Groups



were 21 years of age had a 56 percent chance of being arrested whereas offenders who were age 37 had a 40 percent chance of being arrested. Offenders with no prior arrests had a 40 percent chance of being arrested but offenders with 8 prior arrests had a 56 percent chance of being arrested.

MonDay RSAT and Pre-TC Predicting Arrest. The second model examined the ability of MonDay RSAT group and the pre-TC group to predict whether an offender was arrested. There were three significant predictors of arrest – race, age, and number of prior arrests. Nonwhites, younger offenders, and those with more prior arrests were more likely to be arrested. Again, the coefficient for the group variable was negative, indicating that MonDay RSAT participants were less likely to be arrested when compared to the pre-TC group. This difference was not statistically significant.²⁸


Figure 8 reports the probabilities of being arrested for the MonDay RSAT and the pre-TC group. Whites had a 44 percent chance of being arrested whereas nonwhites had a 60 percent chance of being arrested. Offenders who are age 21 have a 54 percent chance of being arrested whereas offenders who are 37 years of age have a 35 percent chance of being arrested. Offenders with no prior arrests have a 36 percent chance of being arrested whereas offenders with 8 prior arrests have a 53 percent chance of being arrested.

MonDay RSAT and MCCOP Group Predicting Arrest. The third model that was analyzed examined the effectiveness of the therapeutic community treatment compared to MCCOP treatment for predicting arrest. There were two significant predictors – age and number of prior arrests. Younger offenders and those who had more prior arrests were more likely to be arrested. As age increased, the probability of being rearrested declined from 57

²⁸ Offenders in both groups (MonDay RSAT and pre-TC) had approximately a 44 percent chance of being rearrested.

Figure 8. Significant Predictors and Probabilities of Arrest

MonDay RSAT and Pre-TC Groups



percent for 21-year-olds to 45 percent for offenders age 37 (Figure 9). Offenders who had no prior arrests had a 43 percent chance of being arrested whereas offenders who had eight prior arrests had a 59 percent chance of being arrested.

Models Predicting Incarceration


Data on incarceration were also available through the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. Again, several logistic regression models were calculated to predict the likelihood of being incarcerated. The first model shows what factors predict incarceration when examining all groups. The second model predicts incarceration for the MonDay RSAT and pre-TC groups and the third model predicts incarceration for the MonDay RSAT and the MCCOP groups. The variables that were included into the models were race, gender, marital status, completion of 12th grade, age, number or prior convictions, and group (see Table B10 in Appendix B or the coding of the variables).

All Groups Predicting Incarceration. The first model examined the ability of all groups to predict whether an offender was incarcerated after termination from the program. There were two significant factors in the logistic regression predicting arrest; race and gender. More specifically, whites and females were less likely to be incarcerated. It is important to note that the coefficient for the group variable was negative indicating that participants in MonDay RSAT treatment was less likely than the participants in the pre-TC treatment or the MCCOP treatment to be incarcerated. However, this relationship was not statistically significant.²⁹

²⁹ Offenders in the MonDay RSAT group had a 26 percent chance of being incarcerated after termination whereas offenders in the comparison groups (pre-TC and MCCOP) had a 33 percent chance of being incarcerated.

Figure 9. Significant Predictors and Probabilities of Arrest

MonDay RSAT and MCCOP



In order to present the logit coefficients in a fashion that is easily understood, each beta was converted into log-odds probabilities, for each of the significant predictors in the model. Figure 10 shows the results for the model examining the ability of the variables to predict incarceration within one year after termination. Whites had a 33 percent chance of being incarcerated whereas nonwhites had a 44 percent chance of being incarcerated. Males had a 33 percent chance of being incarcerated whereas females had only a 23 percent chance.

MonDay RSAT and Pre-TC Predicting Incarceration. The second model examined the predictive ability of the MonDay RSAT and the pre-TC groups on whether an offender was incarcerated after termination. There were two significant factor – age and race. Younger offenders and nonwhites were more likely to be incarcerated. Offenders who were age 21 had a 35 percent chance of being incarcerated whereas offenders who are 37 years of age have a 21 percent chance of being incarcerated (Figure 11). Whites had a 27 percent chance of being incarcerated whereas nonwhites had a 37 percent chance of being incarcerated. The coefficient for the group variable was negative indicating that offenders in the MonDay RSAT group was less likely to be incarcerated during the time period compared to offenders in the pre-TC group, but the relationship was not significant.³⁰

MonDay RSAT and MCCOP Group Predicting Incarceration. The third model that was analyzed examined the effectiveness of the RSAT therapeutic community treatment and the MCCOP treatment for predicting incarceration. The results reveal that two variables were significant predictors of incarceration – gender and number of prior convictions. Females and offenders with no prior convictions were less likely to be incarcerated. Females had a 24 percent chance of being incarcerated whereas males had a 39 percent chance. Offenders with

³⁰ MonDay RSAT participants had a 27 percent chance of being incarcerated whereas offenders in the pre-TC group had a 33 percent chance of being incarcerated.

Figure 10. Significant Predictors and Probabilities of Incarceration





Figure 11. Significant Predictors and Probabilities of Incarceration

MonDay RSAT and pre-TC Groups



no prior convictions had a 25 percent chance of being incarcerated whereas offenders who had eight prior convictions had a 54 percent chance of being incarcerated (Figure 12). For this model, the coefficient for the group variable was negative meaning that offenders in the MonDay RSAT program was less likely to be incarcerated when compared to offenders in the MCCOP group.³¹ However, the relationship was not statistically significant.

Model Predicting Arrest for the MonDay RSAT Group Only

A logistic regression model was calculated that examined the factors predicting the likelihood of being arrested for the MonDay RSAT group only. The same variables that were included in the previous models were included here with the exception of the group variable. The group variable was not included because it was a constant. In addition, the LSI total score was included in this model.³² There were two significant predictors of arrest – age and type of termination. Younger offenders and those who did not complete treatment were more likely to be arrested.

Figure 13 shows the probabilities of these significant predictors. Offenders who successfully completed the RSAT program had a 42 percent chance of being arrested whereas offenders who did not successfully complete the RSAT program had a 92 percent chance of being arrested. Offenders age 23 had a 51 percent chance of being arrested whereas offenders age 39 had a 34 percent chance of being arrested.³³

³¹ Offenders in the MonDay RSAT group had a 33 percent chance of being incarcerated whereas offenders in the MCCOP group had a 39 percent chance of being incarcerated.

³² The variables and their codings are in Table B10 in Appendix B.

³³ The model was also calculated without the type of termination. The only significant predictor was age. Younger offenders were more likely to be arrested.

Figure 12. Significant Predictors and Probabilities of Incarceration

MonDay RSAT and MCCOP Groups





Figure 13. Significant Predictors and Probabilities of Arrest

MonDay RSAT Group Only



Model Predicting Incarceration for the MonDay RSAT Group Only

A logistic regression model was calculated that examined the factors predicting the likelihood of being incarcerated for the MonDay RSAT group only. The same variables that were included in the previous model were included in this model. There were three significant predictors of arrest – age, type of termination, and LSI score. Younger offenders, those who did not complete treatment, and offenders with higher LSI scores were more likely to be arrested.

Figure 14 shows the probabilities of these significant predictors. Offenders who successfully completed the RSAT program had a 43 percent chance of being incarcerated whereas offenders who did not successfully complete the RSAT program had a 77 percent chance of being incarcerated. Offenders who were age 23 had a 55 percent chance of being incarcerated whereas offenders who were 39 years of age had a 32 percent chance of being incarcerated. Offenders who scored in the “low/moderate” range of the LSI (score of 20) had a 26 percent chance of being incarcerated. Offenders who scored in the “moderate” risk range of the LSI (score of 30) had a 43 percent chance of incarceration. Those who scored in the “medium/high” range of the LSI (score of 40) had a 61 percent chance of being incarcerated.


DISCUSSION

Limitations of the Study

The conclusions of this outcome evaluation are limited by the amount of missing data for the comparison groups on some variables. For example, LSI data were not available for the comparison group. In addition, the study was unable to control for services received after termination from the programs. This type of information was not known for the comparison

Figure 14. Significant Predictors and Probabilities of Incarceration

MonDay RSAT Group Only



group and for less than half of the MonDay RSAT group. In addition, other information such as risk score was not available for the pre-TC and the MCCOP group. This is an important limitation, since it appears that the MonDay RSAT program has made a conscious effort to limit the program to moderate and high-risk offenders. This may not have been true for the pre-TC or the MCCOP group.

Another limitation of the study was that random assignment to groups was not possible. Random assignment to groups would have allowed the groups to be very similar. Instead, the study made comparisons between non-equivalent groups. This is a common problem in correctional research; nonetheless, the study had to use statistical rather than design control.

A third limitation is the time difference between the MCCOP and the pre-TC groups and the MonDay RSAT group. Changes in court and sentencing practices and other external factors can affect offender outcome rates. Thus, we were unable to control for these powerful influences on recidivism rates.

The current study had a follow-up period up to 3.8 years after the offender left the program. The amount of time “at risk” may not be long enough to adequately assess the long-term effects of MonDay’s RSAT program.

General Conclusions

First, it appears that MonDay is targeting an appropriate population for the type of intensive treatment provided by the institution. The data reveal that the participants had extensive criminal histories. The majority of offenders in MonDay scored as either “moderate” or “medium/high” risk for recidivism as determined by the LSI. In addition, the

ASUS global scale indicated that the majority of offenders had a higher degree of overall disruption in life functioning due to drug use. MonDay participants also had extensive cognitive distortions. The majority scored in the clinical range of the overall *How I Think* scale. Individual in the clinical range on this scale may exhibit externalizing psychopathology.

Second, MonDay's therapeutic community has some cognitive behavioral components such as teaching the offenders to identify triggers, but the main focus is on the environment and interactions of the offenders in changing behavior. For example, the therapeutic community is conducted so that offenders are responsible for watching and directing others in the "family." The offenders are responsible for directing the morning and evening meetings and for confronting others for antisocial behaviors or thoughts.

Participation in MonDay's therapeutic community RSAT program reduced the offenders' anxiety, depression, risk-taking, and hostility levels and increased the levels of self-esteem, decision-making, and self-efficacy. In addition, the longer the offenders were in treatment, their self-esteem, decision-making, and self-efficacy increased whereas their level of depression decreased. These factors were not correlated with outcome for the MonDay RSAT group. This finding is not surprising given the risk and need principle. Prior research has shown that depression and self-esteem are not strong predictors of recidivism. They may, however, be responsibility issues that can impede the treatment process, and thus, should be addressed.

Participation in the RSAT program also reduced the offender's levels of cognitive distortions. The offenders' levels of self-centeredness, blaming others, minimizing, assuming the worst, defiance, physical aggression, lying, and stealing were significantly reduced due to

participation in MonDay. Furthermore, a bivariate correlation between these cognitive distortions and the outcome variables revealed that the self-centeredness, minimizing, physical aggression, stealing, overt, and overall *How I Think* scales were significantly correlated with being arrested. The physical aggression, stealing, covert, and overall *How I Think* scales were significantly correlated with being incarcerated.³⁴

Fourth, the rate of program completion is high (87%). This may be due to the fact that once placed in treatment, most infractions were handled within the institution and did not necessitate the removal of the offenders. Successful release from the program should be not confused with progress in treatment for two reasons: 1) program completion is currently time-based. Offenders are released from RSAT once they serve 180 days regardless of whether or not they have made progress in treatment and 2) the results of the service tracking form indicated that only 54 offenders (55.1%) actually completed the last phase of treatment.

Table 17 reviews the significant predictors of arrest across all models. Age and number of prior arrests were significant predictors in all models predicting arrest. Younger offenders and offenders with more prior arrests were more likely to be arrested. Race was a significant predictor in two models – all groups predicting arrest and MonDay RSAT and pre-TC groups predicting arrest. Nonwhites were more likely than whites to be arrested. The group variable was not a significant predictor in any model predicting arrest. However, the coefficient was negative in all models. Thus, participation in MonDay’s RSAT program reduced the probability of arrest when compared to the other treatment modalities.

³⁴ Logistic regression analyses were calculated which included the overall How I Think scale to predict arrest and incarceration. The scale was in the predicted direction (the higher the offenders’ cognitive distortions the more likely to be arrested or incarcerated) but the variable was not statistically significant.

Table 17: Factors Predicting Arrest

All Groups	MonDay RSAT & pre-TC	MonDay RSAT & MCCOP
Age	Age	Age
Race	Race	---
Number of Prior Arrests	Number of Prior Arrests	Number of Prior Arrests

Table 18 reviews the significant predictors of incarceration. Race was a significant predictor in two models. When examining all groups and the MonDay RSAT and the pre-TC groups, nonwhites were more likely to be incarcerated when compared to whites. Gender was a significant predictor in two models. Males were more likely to be incarcerated after termination from the programs. Age was a significant predictor in one model – MonDay RSAT and pre-TC groups predicting incarceration. Younger offenders were more likely to be incarcerated than older offenders. Number of prior convictions was a significant predictor in the model MonDay RSAT and MCCOP groups predicting incarceration. Offenders with more prior convictions were more likely to be incarcerated. Participants in the MonDay

Table 18: Factors Predicting Incarceration

All Groups	MonDay RSAT & pre-TC	MonDay RSAT & MCCOP
Race	Race	---
Gender	---	Gender
---	Age	---
---	---	Number of Prior Convictions

RSAT group was less likely to be incarcerated in all models, but again the reduction in the probability of incarceration was not statistically significant.

It is important to reiterate that this study involved the comparison of offenders in which all received some type of treatment. Consequently, this study was comparing different treatment modalities (i.e., 12-step outpatient treatment, residential treatment, and a modified TC) and not treatment versus no treatment groups. It is not surprising therefore, that we did not find substantial differences in the rate of failure between the treatment groups.

Recommendations

The following are offered based on the findings of the outcome evaluation:

1. MonDay should continue the therapeutic community approach. The results report that participation in MonDay's RSAT program reduced the probability of being arrested or incarcerated when compared to the participants in the traditional residential treatment (pre-TC) and the outpatient treatment (MCCOP). However, the reductions were not statistically significant.
2. MonDay should develop completion criteria that are not time-based. Completion of treatment should be based on acquisition of pro-social attitudes and behaviors and not length of time. The results revealed that cognitive distortions were significantly correlated with outcome. Thus, completion should be centered on eliminating the cognitive distortions.
3. Research has shown that aftercare is an important component of therapeutic communities (Knight, Simpson, and Hiller, 1999; Wexler, Melnick, Lowe, and Peters, 1999). Accordingly, MonDay should strengthen the aftercare component. It is important that offenders released from MonDay receive high quality aftercare services that address their needs.

4. MonDay should continue to collect data that would enable the outcome study to continue. The current study was limited in the amount of follow-up time to track the offender. However, if MonDay continues the study, research can further examine the long-term effects of the therapeutic community RSAT programs.

REFERENCES

- Andrew, D. A., and Bonta, J. (1995). Level of Service Inventory-Revised. Tonawanda, NY: Multi-Health Systems.
- Antonwicz, D.H. and Ross, R.R. (1994). "Essential components of successful rehabilitation programs for offenders." International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 38(2): 97-104.
- Barriga, A. Q., Gibbs, J. C., Potter, G., and Liau, A. K. (1999) How I Think Questionnaire.
- Brook, R. C., and Whitehead, P. C. (1980). "Treatment of drug abuse." In M. Tonry and J. Q. Wilson (Eds.), Drugs and Crime. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- DeLeon, G. (1990a). "Treatment strategies." In J. Inciardi (Ed.), Handbook of Drug Control in the United States (pp. 115-138). Westport: Greenwood Press.
- DeLeon, G. (1990b). "Effectiveness of therapeutic communities." In J. J. Platt, C. D. Kaplin, and P. J. McKim (Eds.), The Effectiveness of Drug Abuse Treatment: Dutch and American Perspectives (pp. 113-126). Malabar, FL: Robert E. Krieger Publishing.
- DeLeon, G. and Ziegenfuss, J. T. (1986). Therapeutic Communities for Addictions: Readings in Theory, Research and Practice. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.
- DeLeon, G. and Rosenthal, M. (1979). "Therapeutic communities." In R. L. Dupont, A. Goldstein, and J. O'Donnell (Eds.), Handbook on Drug Abuse (pp. 39-48). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Faupel, C. E. (1981). "Drug treatment and criminality: Methodological and theoretical considerations." In J. A. Inciardi (Ed.), The Drugs Crime Connection (pp. 183-206). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Gendreau, P. and Andrews, D. A. (1994). Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (4th ed.). St. John, New Brunswick: University of New Brunswick.
- Holsinger, A.M. (1999). Opening the Black Box : Assessing the Relationship Between Program Integrity and Recidivism. (Dissertation). Ann Arbor, MI: UMI.
- Inciardi, J. A., Martin, S. S., Butzin, C. A., Hooper, R. M., and Harrison, L. D. (1997). "An effective model of prison-based treatment for drug-involved offenders." Journal of Drug Issues, 27(2): 261-278.
- Lipton, D. S. (1998). "Therapeutic communities: History, effectiveness and prospects." Corrections Today (October): 106-109.

Knight, K., Simpson, D. D., and Hiller, M. L. (1999). "Three-year reincarceration outcomes for in-prison therapeutic community treatment in Texas." The Prison Journal,79(3): 337-351.

Sandhu, T. S. (1981). "The effectiveness of community-based correctional programs." in S. Sandhu (Ed.), Community Corrections: New Horizons (pp. 296-351). Springfield: BannerStone House.

Simpson, D. D. (1984). "National treatment system based on the drug abuse reporting program (DARP) follow-up research." In F. Tims and J. Ludford (Eds.), Drug Abuse Treatment Evaluation: Strategies, Progress, and Prospects (pp. 29-41). National Institute on Drug Abuse Research Monograph No. 51. Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Simpson, D. D. and Knight, K. (1998). TCU Data Collection Forms for Correctional Residential Treatment. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University, Institute of Behavioral Research [On-line]. Available: www.ibr.tcu.edu.

Wanberg, K. (1994). Adult Substance Use Survey.

Wexler, H. K. (1995). "The success of therapeutic communities for substance abusers in American prisons." Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, 27(1): 57-66.

Wexler, H. K., Melnick, G., Lowe, L., and Peters, J. (1999). "Three-year reincarceration outcomes for Amity in-prison therapeutic community and aftercare in California." The Prison Journal,79(3): 321-336.

Yochelson, S. and Samenow, S. E. (1976). The Criminal Personality: A Profile for Change. New York, NY: Jason Aronson.

APPENDIX A

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

14) _____ Level of conviction offense:
1=F1 2=F2 3=F3 4=F4 5=F5 6=M1 7=M2 8=M3 9=M4

15) ____/____/____ Date screened for RSAT

16) ____/____/____ Date placed in RSAT program

CRIMINAL HISTORY

17) ____/____/____ Date of first arrest

_____ If exact date is unknown, please indicate age of first arrest

18) Number of prior arrests (adult and juvenile) _____ Felony _____ Misdemeanor

19) Number of prior convictions (adult and juvenile) _____ Felony _____ Misdemeanor

20) _____ Has the offender ever been arrested on a drug charge? 1=Yes 2=No

21) _____ Number of prior sentences to a secure facility

22) _____ Number of prior sentences to community supervision

23) _____ Number of unsuccessful terminations from community supervision

SUBSTANCE USE HISTORY

24) _____ First Drug of Choice

- | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1=heroin | 7=LSD |
| 2=non-crack cocaine | 8=PCP |
| 3=crack | 9=inhalants |
| 4=amphetamines | 10=over the counter drugs |
| 5=barbiturates/tranquilizers | 11=alcohol |
| 6=marijuana | 12=Other (specify: _____) |

25) _____ Second Drug of Choice (use codes for question #24)

26) _____ Age of first alcohol use

27) _____ Age of first drug use

28) _____ Do any immediate family members have a substance abuse problem? 1=Yes 2=No

29) _____ Has the offender received previous drug/alcohol treatment? 1=Yes 2=No

If yes, indicate the number of times the offender has experienced each of the following types of treatment:

- _____ Detoxification
- _____ Methadone maintenance
- _____ Outpatient
- _____ Short-term inpatient (30 days or less)
- _____ Residential

30) _____ Has the offender been dual diagnosed with mental illness and substance abuse?
1=Yes 2=No

Please attach the following completed instruments OR a summary of results/scores:

Noble - PII

Monday - LSI and ASUS

OHIO'S RESIDENTIAL SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT PROGRAMS

Client Self-rating Form

(Adapted from TCU DCJTC Client Evaluation of Self and Treatment)

Today's date: ____/____/____

To be completed by staff: ____ intake ____ discharge

Full name: _____

Birthdate: ____/____/____

Directions: Each of the statements below describes a way that you might or might not feel about yourself. There are no right or wrong answers, we just want to know what you think. Please use the following scale to tell us whether you agree or disagree with each of the statements listed below. Just circle the one number closest to your opinion (to the right of each statement).

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided/ Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree

Circle One

- | 1. You like to take chances..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2. You feel sad or depressed..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. You need help in dealing with your drug/alcohol use..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Sometimes you feel that you are being pushed
around in your life..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. You consider how your actions will affect others..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. You have much to be proud of..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. You want to be in a drug/alcohol treatment program..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. In general, you are satisfied with yourself..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. You like the "fast" life..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. You feel mistreated by other people..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. It is urgent that you find help immediately for your drug/
alcohol use..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. You have thoughts of committing suicide..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. You have trouble sitting still for long..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. You plan ahead..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided/ Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree

Circle One

15. This treatment program seems too demanding for you.....	1	2	3	4	5
16. You like others to feel afraid of you.....	1	2	3	4	5
17. You feel lonely.....	1	2	3	4	5
18. You like friends who are wild.....	1	2	3	4	5
19. Your life has gone out of control.....	1	2	3	4	5
20. You like to do things that are strange or exciting.....	1	2	3	4	5
21. You have too many outside responsibilities now to be in this treatment program.....	1	2	3	4	5
22. You feel like a failure.....	1	2	3	4	5
23. You have trouble sleeping.....	1	2	3	4	5
24. You feel interested in life.....	1	2	3	4	5
25. You sometimes want to fight or hurt others.....	1	2	3	4	5
26. You are tired of the problems caused by drugs/alcohol.....	1	2	3	4	5
27. You think about the possible results of your actions.....	1	2	3	4	5
28. You stay away from anything dangerous.....	1	2	3	4	5
29. You feel you are basically no good.....	1	2	3	4	5
30. This treatment may be your last chance to solve your drug/ alcohol problems.....	1	2	3	4	5
31. You have a hot temper.....	1	2	3	4	5
32. You have trouble making decisions.....	1	2	3	4	5

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided/ Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree

Circle One

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 33. You think of several different ways to solve a problem..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 34. You feel nervous..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 35. There is really no way you can solve some of the problems
you have..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 36. You analyze problems by looking at all the choices..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 37. Your temper gets you into fights or other trouble..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 38. You will give up your friends and hangouts to solve your
drug/alcohol problems..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 39. You make decisions without thinking about consequences..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 40. You have trouble concentrating or remembering things..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 41. There is little you can do to change many of the important
things in your life..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 42. This type of treatment program will <u>not</u> be very helpful to you.. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 43. You feel extra tired or run down..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 44. You make good decisions..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 45. You feel afraid of certain things, like crowds or going out alone. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 46. You want to get your life straightened out..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 47. You only do things that feel safe..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 48. You get mad at other people easily..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 49. You wish you had more respect for yourself..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 50. You have little control over the things that happen to you..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided/ Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree

Circle One

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 51. You can quit using drugs/alcohol with without any help..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 52. You worry or brood a lot..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 53. You are in this treatment program because someone else made you come..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 54. You often feel helpless in dealing with the problems of life..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 55. You have carried weapons, like knives or guns..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 56. You feel tense or keyed-up..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 57. You plan to stay in this treatment program for awhile..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 58. You are always very careful..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 59. You think about what causes your current problems..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 60. You can do just about anything you really set your mind to do.. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 61. You feel a lot of anger inside you..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 62. You feel tightness or tension in your muscles..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 63. What happens to you in the future mostly depends on you..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 64. This treatment program can really help you..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 65. You feel you are unimportant to others..... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

The "HOW I THINK" Questionnaire

NAME: _____ DATE: _____

AGE: _____ Circle One: Male/ Female

To be completed by staff: _____ intake _____ discharge

Each statement in this questionnaire may describe how you think about things in life. Read each statement carefully. Then ask yourself, "Is it fair to say that this statement describes my thinking within the past six months?" Your answers will be kept confidential.

Mark your answer on the sheet. Don't say it out loud.

Any questions?

O.K., turn the page and begin.

1. Sometimes I get bored.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

2. I can't help losing my temper a lot.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

3. I might as well lie- when I tell the truth, people don't believe me anyway.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

4. Everybody has the right to be happy.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

5. I have tried to get even with someone.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

6. When I lose my temper it's because people try to make me mad.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

7. People are always trying to hassle me.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

8. If I lie to people, that's nobody's business but my own.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

9. If I really want something, it should be mine.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

10. You can't trust people because they will always lie to you.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

11. When I get mad, I don't care who gets hurt.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

12. I have forgotten important things.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

13. Sometimes you have to lie to get out of trouble.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

14. When friends need you, you should be there for them.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

15. People are always trying to start fights with me.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

16. If I tell someone off, it's their fault for trying to tell me what to do.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

17. People need to be roughed up once in awhile.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

18. If you know you can get away with it, only a fool wouldn't steal.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

19. I have taken things without asking.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

20. You should hurt people first, before they hurt you.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

21. Everybody lies. It's no big deal.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

22. It's important to think of other people's feelings.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

23. Everybody steals; you might as well get your share.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

24. The police are going to hassle you whether you steal or not.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

25. I sometimes want things that my friends have.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

26. People force me to lie when they ask me too many questions.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

27. If I make a mistake, it's not my fault if I got mixed up with the wrong crowd.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

28. If I really want to do something, I don't care if it's legal or not.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

29. I have sometimes said something bad about a friend.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

30. No matter how hard I try; I can't help getting in trouble.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

31. If you don't push people around, you will always get picked on.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

32. I get into arguments, but other people always start them.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

33. I am generous with my friends.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

34. It's important to look at all sides of a situation.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

35. If someone is careless enough to lose a wallet, they deserve to have it stolen.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

36. It's O.K. to tell a lie if someone is dumb enough to fall for it.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

37. Getting what you need is the only important thing.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

38. I have covered up things that I have done.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

39. If I hit someone, it's their fault for making me mad.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

40. I have done bad things that I haven't told people about.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

41. If I see something I like, I take it.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

42. A lie doesn't really matter if you don't know the person.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

43. If people don't cooperate with me, it's not my fault if they get hurt.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

44. Sometimes I gossip about other people.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

45. If a store or homeowner gets robbed, it's their fault for not having better security.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

46. It's no use trying to stay out of fights.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

47. Everybody needs help once in awhile.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

48. It's O.K. to push people around if you're in a bad mood.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

49. You might as well steal; people would steal from you if they have the chance.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

50. In the past, I have lied to get myself out of trouble.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

51. You might as well steal. If you don't take it somebody else will.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

52. I have sometimes done things that bother other people.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

53. Rules are mostly meant for other people.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

54. Sometimes you have to hurt someone if they don't cooperate with you.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

55. Stores make so much money that it's O.K. to just take things you need.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

56. I have taken advantage of other people.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

57. Taking a car doesn't really hurt anyone if nothing happens to the car and the owner gets it back.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

58. Only a coward would walk away from a fight.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

59. You should get what you need even if it means someone has to get hurt.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

60. People should be honest with me.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

61. If someone leaves a car unlocked, they are asking to have it stolen.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

62. Everybody breaks the law; it's no big deal.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

63. You have to get even with people who don't show you respect.

agree strongly	agree	agree slightly	disagree slightly	disagree	disagree strongly
-------------------	-------	-------------------	----------------------	----------	----------------------

OHIO'S RESIDENTIAL SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT PROGRAMS

Standardized Termination Form

Please indicate the circumstances surrounding the client's discharge from the program including the date of discharge, type of discharge, and plan for aftercare.

1) Client Name: _____

2) Social Security No: _____

3) Program code: _____ 1= Nova House; 2 = Mohican; 3 = MonDay; 4 = Noble

4) Date of discharge ____/____/____

5) Type of discharge _____

- 1=Successful completion (achieved treatment goals)
- 2=Successful completion (completed required time but did not achieve treatment goals)
- 3=Unsuccessful termination (disciplinary, lack of participation/progress)
- 4=Voluntary withdrawal from program
- 5=Escape/Absconson
- 6=Unable to participate due to reclassification, medical, out to court
- 7=Other (specify: _____)

6) Living arrangements upon discharge _____

- 1=With family/relatives
- 2=With friends
- 3=By him/her self in apartment/house
- 4=Group home
- 5=Halfway house
- 6=Foster care
- 7=Other (specify: _____)

7) Has continued drug/alcohol treatment been arranged for the client? _____ 1=Yes; 2=No

8) Criminal Justice Placement _____

- 1=Probation supervision
- 2=Parole supervision
- 3=Jail
- 4=Prison
- 5=DYS institution
- 6=Other (specify: _____)

9) To facilitate the collection of follow-up data, please provide the following information on the agency responsible for the offender's supervision/custody upon discharge from RSAT.

Agency (probation, parole, institution) _____

Probation/Parole Officer's name _____

Address _____

City, State, Zip _____

Phone Number _____

10) Please provide reassessment information by attaching the following items Or a summary of results/scores.

- Monday - LSI reassessment
- Noble - PII reassessment

APPENDIX B
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

TableB1: Adult Substance Use Survey For MonDay RSAT Group

ASUS Category	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Involvement (range 0-40)	192	0.00	37.00	18.41	8.85
Disruption (range 0-76)	192	0.00	71.00	41.01	16.17
Social (range 0-32)	192	4.00	28.00	14.09	4.59
Mood (range 0-27)	192	0.00	26.00	12.49	5.21
Defensive (range 0-15)	192	0.00	85.00	5.53	6.65
Motivation (range 0-)	64	8.00	21.00	19.25	2.90
Global (range 0-190)	192	11.00	181.00	86.49	27.66

Figure B1: ASUS Involvement Scale

Decile Scores




Figure B2: ASUS Disruption Scale




Figure B3: ASUS Social Scale

Decile Scores




Figure B4: ASUS Mood Scale

Decile Scores




Figure B5: ASUS Defensive Scale




Table B2: Level of Service Inventory for the MonDay RSAT Group (Intake)

LSI Category	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Criminal History (range 0-10)	188	0.00	8.00	4.92	1.76
Employment/Education (range 0-10)	188	1.00	10.00	6.73	1.96
Financial (range 0-2)	188	1.00	2.00	1.43	.50
Family/Marital (range 0-4)	188	0.00	4.00	2.68	1.34
Accommodation (range 0-3)	188	0.00	3.00	1.62	1.11
Leisure/Recreation (range 0-2)	188	1.00	2.00	1.99	.07
Companions (range 0-5)	188	2.00	4.00	2.03	.19
Alcohol/Drug Problem (range 0-9)	188	3.00	9.00	6.52	.95
Emotional/Personal (range 0-5)	188	0.00	4.00	.81	1.15
Attitudes/Orientation (range 0-4)	188	0.00	4.00	1.99	1.78
Total (range 0-54)	213	18.00	42.00	30.35	5.01

Table B3: Reliabilities for The Client Self Rating for the MonDay RSAT Group

Scale	N	Pre-test	N	Post-test
Anxiety	201	.6910	145	.7620
Depression	199	.6255	142	.7225
Self-esteem	200	.7033	143	.8177
Decision Making	200	.7938	143	.8270
Risk Taking	197	.6991	147	.8156
Hostility	202	.7266	148	.8212
Self-efficacy	200	.6440	146	.4650
Desire for Help	83	.7568	57	.7455
Treatment Readiness	84	.7125	57	.7001

Table B4: Reliabilities for How I Think for the MonDay RSAT Group

Scale	N	Pre-test
Self-centered	88	.7289
Blaming others	88	.8093
Minimizing	88	.6665
Assuming the worst	88	.8488
Oppositional defiance	88	.7331
Physical aggression	89	.8205
Lying	88	.6979
Stealing	88	.7537
Overt	88	.8801
Covert	86	.8528
How I Think	85	.9310

Table B5: Descriptive Statistics for How I Think Questionnaire – Time 1*

Scale	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
<u>Cognitive Distortions</u>					
Anomalous Responding (range 1-6)	59	1.63	4.25	3.65	.54
Self-centered (range 1-6)	59	2.11	5.00	3.35	.68
Blaming Others (range 1-6)	59	2.00	5.50	3.34	.67
Minimizing/Mislabeling (range 1-6)	58	2.89	6.00	4.39	.62
Assuming the Worst (range 1-6)	58	1.73	5.09	2.78	.65
<u>Behavioral Referents</u>					
Opposition-Defiance (range 1-6)	59	2.20	5.10	3.39	.68
Physical Aggression (range 1-6)	59	2.00	5.50	3.49	.69
Lying (range 1-6)	58	2.38	5.38	3.57	.59
Stealing (range 1-6)	58	2.55	5.55	3.29	.59
<u>Summary Scores</u>					
Covert (range 1-6)	57	2.60	5.46	3.44	.56
Overt (range 1-6)	59	2.35	5.30	3.44	.65
How I Think (range 1-6)	57	2.59	5.39	3.46	.59

* Includes the scores that may be considered “suspect” because the AR scale is greater than 4.0 but less than 4.25.

Table B6: Individual Counseling for the MonDay RSAT Group

Session Number	N	Minimum Minutes	Maximum Minutes	Mean	SD
Session 1	68	10.00	135.00	36.69	19.37
Session 2	68	10.00	65.00	32.05	11.77
Session 3	68	15.00	90.00	33.44	14.63
Session 4	68	15.00	115.00	32.87	16.49
Session 5	66	15.00	60.00	31.82	9.95
Session 6	64	10.00	60.00	30.55	10.77
Session 7	61	10.00	65.00	30.00	11.26
Session 8	56	15.00	60.00	30.63	10.27
Session 9	50	15.00	105.00	30.60	14.80
Session 10	42	10.00	60.00	29.05	9.06
Session 11	27	5.00	60.00	27.59	11.30
Session 12	20	5.00	60.00	27.75	11.18
Session 13	12	15.00	45.00	25.83	9.00
Session 14	6	15.00	30.00	21.67	6.83
Session 15	4	20.00	30.00	27.50	5.00
Session 16	2	15.00	30.00	22.50	10.61
Total	68	135.00	845.00	314.15	109.09

Table B7: The Effects of Time on Psychological and Social Functioning, With Controls for Pre-test Scores

	Anxiety			Depression			Self Esteem		
Independent Variables	<i>b</i>	SE	Beta	<i>b</i>	SE	Beta	<i>b</i>	SE	Beta
Time	-.008	.006	-.107	-.011	.004	-.200*	.015	.005	.224*
Pre-test score	.403	.079	.392*	.296	.078	.299*	.413	.086	.367*
Constant	10.273	1.995*	---	10.121	1.600*	---	11.564	1.699*	---
F-value		14.32*			10.96*			15.23*	
R ²		.17			.14			.18	

	Decision-making			Risk-taking			Hostility		
Independent Variables	<i>b</i>	SE	Beta	<i>b</i>	SE	Beta	<i>b</i>	SE	Beta
Time	.012	.006	.167*	.002	.006	.034	-.057	.006	-.069
Pre-test score	.162	.071	.188*	.395	.087	.356*	.470	.079	.444*
Constant	27.803	2.248*	---	11.324	2.150*	---	10.554	1.958*	---
F-value		4.99*			10.45*			18.37*	
R ²		.07			.13			.20	

* p = .05

Table B7: The Effects of Time on Psychological and Social Functioning, With Controls for Pre-test Scores (continued)

	Self-efficacy			Antisocial Attitudes			Desire for Help		
Independent Variables	<i>b</i>	SE	Beta	<i>b</i>	SE	Beta	<i>b</i>	SE	Beta
Time	.014	.005	.205*	.055	.006	.110	-.037	.020	-.244
Pre-test score	.524	.081	.469*	.338	.110	.340*	.108	.121	.119
Constant	11.612	2.114*	---	7.186	1.675*	---	30.004	4.935*	---
F-value		24.91*			5.19*			2.51	
R ²		.26			.13			.09	

* p = .05

Treatment Readiness

Independent Variables	<i>b</i>	SE	Beta
Time	.023	.023	.138
Pre-test score	.114	.145	.108
Constant	22.221	5.945*	---
F-value		.693	
R ²		.03	

Table B8: Length of Time in Treatment

	MonDay RSAT (N = 226)				Pre-TC (N = 244)			
	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD
Number of Days:*	7	545	169.21	46.48	15	581	126.93	53.69

* p <.01

Table B9: Regression Coefficients Predicting Successful Completion

Factor	Beta	Significance Level
Race	-.1418	.8329
Age	.0224	.5838
Gender	-.7332	.3721
Marital Status	.6408	.5632
Complete 12 th Grade	-.3983	.5632
LSI Score	-.0880	.2067
Constant	5.5373	
-2 Log Likelihood	80.892	
Goodness of Fit	186.401	

Table B10: List of Measures for the Independent and Dependent Variables in Regression Models

Independent Variables

Race: 0 = White; 1 = Nonwhite

Age: 18 - 59

Gender: 0 = Female; 1 = Male

Marital Status: 0 = Not Married; 1 = Married

Grade 12: 0 = Did not complete the 12th grade; 1 = Completed the 12th grade

Number of Prior Arrest: 0 – 36

Number of Prior Convictions: 0 – 11

Completion of Treatment: 0 = Did not complete treatment; 1 = Completed treatment

Level of Service Inventory (LSI) Score: 18 – 42

Group: 0 = all comparison cases combined; 1 = MonDay RSAT group
0 = Pre-TC; 1 = MonDay RSAT group
0 = MCCOP; 1 = MonDay RSAT group

Dependent Variables

Arrested: 0=no; 1 = yes

Incarcerated: 0 = no; 1 = yes

Table B11: Regression Coefficients Predicting Arrest = 1*

Factor	Beta	Significance Level
Race	.559	.002
Age	-.036	.004
Gender	.280	.152
Marital Status	-.184	.434
Complete Grade 12	-.284	.200
Prior Arrests	.081	.000
Group	-.045	.818
Constant	.359	
-2 Log Likelihood	745.092	
Nagelkerke R ²	.107	

*All Groups

Table B12: Regression Coefficients Predicting Arrest = 1*

Factor	Beta	Significance Level
Race	.624	.003
Age	-.049	.001
Gender	.044	.840
Marital Status	-.110	.682
Complete Grade 12	-.219	.324
Prior Arrests	.086	.001
Group	-.006	.980
Constant	.822	
-2 Log Likelihood	570.602	
Nagelkerke R ²	.118	

*Monday RSAT and pre-TC Groups

Table B13: Regression Coefficients Predicting Arrest = 1*

Factor	Beta	Significance Level
Race	.204	.392
Age	-.030	.036
Gender	.445	.095
Marital Status	.140	.643
Complete Grade 12	-.399	.108
Prior Arrests	.082	.008
Group	-.005	.985
Constant	.152	
-2 Log Likelihood	445.108	
Nagelkerke R ²	.085	

*Monday RSAT and MCCOP groups

Table B14: Regression Coefficients Predicting Incarceration = 1*

Factor	Beta	Significance Level
Race	.457	.019
Age	-.024	.079
Gender	.503	.021
Marital Status	.113	.654
Complete Grade 12	.025	.903
Prior Convictions	.053	.070
Group	-.319	.144
Constant	-.706	
-2 Log Likelihood	663.595	
Nagelkerke R ²	.063	

*All groups

Table B15: Regression Coefficients Predicting Incarceration = 1*

Factor	Beta	Significance Level
Race	.472	.037
Age	-.045	.011
Gender	.381	.120
Marital Status	-.051	.864
Complete Grade 12	-.043	.861
Prior Convictions	.047	.149
Group	-.254	.311
Constant	.028	
-2 Log Likelihood	496.776	
Nagelkerke R ²	.080	

*Monday RSAT and pre- TC

Table B16: Regression Coefficients Predicting Incarceration = 1*

Factor	Beta	Significance Level
Race	.015	.957
Age	-.031	.074
Gender	.675	.042
Marital Status	.330	.327
Complete Grade 12	.140	.618
Prior Convictions	.155	.006
Group	-.248	.351
Constant	-.836	
-2 Log Likelihood	361.462	
Nagelkerke R ²	.089	

*Monday RSAT and MCCOP

Table B17: Regression Coefficients Predicting Arrest = 1*

Factor	Beta	Significance Level
Race	.060	.851
Gender	.458	.171
Marital Status	.682	.090
Complete Grade 12	-.364	.284
Age	-.041	.033
LSI	.054	.088
Type of Termination	-2.150	.008
Constant	1.005	
-2 Log Likelihood	268.055	
Nagelkerke R ²	.167	

*Monday RSAT group only

Table B18: Regression Coefficients Predicting Incarceration = 1*

Factor	Beta	Significance Level
Race	-.358	.328
Gender	.654	.093
Marital Status	.488	.276
Complete Grade 12	.099	.794
Age	-.059	.009
LSI	.074	.043
Type of Termination	-1.521	.015
Constant	-.456	
-2 Log Likelihood	227.158	
Nagelkerke R ²	.182	

*Monday RSAT group only