Assessing Released Inmates for Substance-Abuse-Related Service Needs

Steven Belenko

High rates of substance abuse and recidivism and limited in-prison and postrelease treatment access and transitional planning complicate community reintegration. Moreover, drug-related health and social problems are related to treatment outcomes. In the framework of risk-responsivity theory and structured, integrated reentry models, this article argues for new, psychometrically sound assessment tools that are multidimensional, facilitate risk management and service linkages, and combine static and dynamic factors and multiple time frames. The organizational complexity of reentry increases the urgency to develop tools to accurately identify parolee service needs. Such tools will increase knowledge about factors determining or mediating postrelease outcomes.

Keywords: *reentry; assessment tool; service linkages; parolees*

SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND THE CORRECTIONAL POPULATION

The connections between the abuse of illegal drugs and crime have been well documented (Bradford, Greenberg, & Motayne, 1992; Goldstein, 1985; Tonry & Wilson, 1990). Recent data from the Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring program indicate that a range of 42% to 86% (median 67%) of adult male arrestees (39 sites) and 52% to 82% (median 68%) of female arrestees (25 sites) tested positive for marijuana, cocaine, opiates, methamphetamine, or phencyclidine (Zhang, 2004). Among male arrestees, a range of 24% to 50% was at risk for drug dependence (31% to 63% of females). Sixty-nine percent of state prison inmates report regular lifetime illicit drug use (Belenko, 2002a); 42% of state prison inmates have used cocaine, 27% crack, and 21% heroin. More than 80% of state prison inmates have indications of serious drug or alcohol involvement (Belenko & Peugh, 2005).

STEVEN BELENKO, Ph.D., is a senior scientist at the Treatment Research Institute at the University of Pennsylvania and is adjunct professor of psychology in the School of Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania. His primary research interests are the impact of drug offenders on the criminal justice system, substance abuse treatment for adult and juvenile offenders, treatment and HIV services access, and drug courts.

CRIME & DELINQUENCY, Vol. 52 No. 1, January 2006 94-113
DOI: 10.1177/0011128705281755
© 2006 Sage Publications

Between 1980 and 2003, the number of inmates in the United States quadrupled from 501,886 to 2,212,475, with the state prison population increasing by more than 300% to 1,226,175 (Harrison & Beck, 2004). These increases have been fueled mainly by drug-related crime as well as more arrests, convictions, and incarcerative sentences for drug crimes (Belenko, 2000; Belenko & Peugh, 1999). Inmates who regularly use drugs or alcohol have higher recidivism rates than other inmates. National inmate survey data indicate that the more prior sentences, the more likely that the inmate is a regular drug user (Belenko, 2002a). Within 3 years, about 95% of released state inmates with drug use histories return to drug use (Martin, Butzin, Saum, & Inciardi, 1999), 68% are rearrested, 47% are reconvicted, and 25% are sentenced to prison for a new crime (Langan & Levin, 2002).

The high rates of drug involvement and recidivism among arrestees and inmates raise multiple challenges for supervising offenders following release. At the end of 2003, there were 4,848,575 offenders under community supervision (including 4,073,987 on probation and 774,588 on parole), more than twice the number of inmates in correctional facilities (Glaze & Palla, 2004). Some two thirds have a history of illegal drug use, including 31% who have used cocaine or crack (Mumola, 1998). More than 630,000 prison inmates were released to the community in 2002 after completing their sentences or being released to parole supervision (Harrison & Karberg, 2004); 80% were released to parole. Rates of technical violations of parole conditions are high (Beck & Mumola, 1999; Langan & Levin, 2002; Petersilia, 2001; Travis, 2000). In 1998, 37% of state prison commitments were for violations of parole or other conditional release (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2002). Repeated recycling of offenders into secure custody—particularly adult males from neighborhoods and families already affected by poverty, instability, and in many cases substance abuse—can have devastating consequences (Clear & Corbett, 1999). Inmates are separated from the mainstream community and confront greater challenges to integration, including having to create reliable ties with new support networks (Clear & Rose, 1999) and addressing health and social needs (Travis, Solomon, & Waul, 2001).

In particular, high rates of substance abuse and relapse and the difficulty of accessing effective treatment (both while in custody and in the community) greatly complicate reintegration. Failure to address postrelease substance abuse greatly reduces the likelihood that released inmates will be able to obtain and hold jobs, participate in training programs, reunify with families, or comply with parole supervision requirements (Taxman, Byrne, & Young, 2003).

Improving the Effectiveness of Treatment and Supervision for Parolees

The available evidence on inmate and other offender treatment suggests that reductions in postrelease relapse and recidivism are contingent on engaging offenders in continuing care following release (Butzin, Martin, & Inciardi, 2005; Inciardi, Martin, & Butzin, 2004; Prendergast, Hall, Wexler, Melnick, & Cao, 2004). Although there is increasing attention being paid to implementing "seamless systems of care" in the criminal justice system (Taxman, 1998), access to continuing care in the community that is linked to treatment services received in the prison remains relatively uncommon (Belenko & Peugh, 2005). Without aftercare or transitional services, inmates reentering the community face a difficult time even if they have received treatment while in custody (Hammett, Roberts, & Kennedy, 2001; Taxman, Byrne, et al., 2003).

An additional complicating factor for successful reentry and reintegration is that substance-abuse-related problems (i.e., psychiatric, employment, family-social) may be equally predictive of treatment outcome than the nature or severity of substance use; the addition of health and/or social services to standard addiction care can significantly improve treatment outcomes (McLellan, Arndt, Metzger, & O'Brien, 1993). Accordingly, there may be two key dimensions to consider in making appropriate service linkages for reentering inmates: drug use severity and the other service needs (Belenko & Peugh, 2005). Evidence that clients with a higher severity of drug use have better outcomes in more intensive or highly structured treatment comes from research on national samples of treatment clients (Simpson, Joe, Fletcher, Hubbard, & Anglin, 1999), therapeutic communities (Melnick, De Leon, Thomas, & Kressel, 2001), outpatient settings (Rychtarik et al., 2000; Thornton, Gottheil, Weinstein, & Kerachsky, 1998), and Project MATCH (Project MATCH Research Group, 1998) for alcohol patients. Studies in various community treatment settings have found that matching services to specific client needs (e.g., psychological services, housing, employment) improves treatment outcomes (Gastfriend & McLellan, 1997; Hser, Polinsky, Maglione, & Anglin, 1999; Mattson et al., 1994; McLellan, Luborsky, Woody, O'Brien, & Druley, 1983; McLellan et al., 1993).

In addition, research has found that social and behavioral factors can be significant predictors of offender recidivism and persistent criminal behavior. These factors include employment (Belenko, Foltz, Lang, & Sung, 2004; Laub & Sampson, 2001; Sung, 2003), family status and family functioning (Gendreau, Little, & Goggin, 1996; Peters & Murrin, 2000), education

(Peters & Murrin, 2000; Sung, 2003), personality disorders (Gendreau et al., 1996), and social achievement (Gendreau et al., 1996).

These considerations suggest that making appropriate and effective referrals to substance abuse treatment for newly released inmates and parolees requires more than a simple assessment for drug abuse or dependence (Belenko & Peugh, 1999; Hammett, Gaiter, & Crawford, 1998; Hammett et al., 2001). For example, given the connections between crime, poverty, and poor health, many inmates enter prison in need of medical services (Anno, 1991; Hammett, Harmon, & Maruschak, 1999; Marquart, Merianos, Hebert, & Carroll, 1997). Findings from a public health-corrections model indicate that receiving continuity of health care at a central facility lowered recidivism for released inmates (Hammett et al., 2001). Health services of particular relevance for drug-involved inmates include treatment and prevention of HIV and other infectious diseases (Hammett et al., 1998). The large numbers of at-risk substance abusers in prisons suggests a need to educate inmates about reducing their risk behaviors and give them the tools to lower the incidence of HIV infection after they are released into the community (Belenko, Langley, Crimmins, & Chaple, 2004; Braithwaite & Arriola, 2003). Offenders under probation or parole supervision are also at high risk for HIV but receive few effective interventions to reduce risk (Belenko et al., 2004; Martin, O'Connell, Inciardi, Beard, & Surratt, 2003). Offenders also have high rates of mental health conditions and comorbid substance abuse and mental health disorders (Belenko, Lang, & O'Connor, 2003; Ditton, 1999; Lamb & Weinberger, 1998); 32% of inmates with a history of regular drug use and 28% of alcohol-involved inmates had indications of a mental health problem (Belenko, 2002a). But treating comorbid mental health and substance abuse presents substantial complications and special needs that are seldom addressed in practice (Belenko et al., 2003; Broner, Borum, & Gawley, 2002; Hoff & Rosenheck, 1999). Offender treatment retention studies have found that mental health disorders are predictive of early termination (Lang & Belenko, 2000) and that those with a comorbid psychiatric diagnosis are less likely to enter substance abuse treatment in the first place (Claus & Kendleberger, 2002).

Employment problems can also affect long-term recovery and complicate community transition (Belenko & Peugh, 2005; Finn, 1999; Leukefeld, McDonald, Staton, & Mateyoke-Scrivner, 2004; Reif, Horgan, Ritter, & Tompkins, 2004). Released inmates with few marketable skills and limited job opportunities are more susceptible to relapse and resumption of illegal activity (Laub & Sampson, 2001; Platt, 1995; Travis et al., 2001). Furthermore, for many inmates, their physical or mental health problems make it difficult for them to sustain employment or successfully complete educational

programs (Belenko, 2002a). Accordingly, an important goal of an effective reentry strategy is to identify employment and training needs to provide the skills training to enable the offender to be reintegrated into the legitimate labor market or to provide basic literacy skills, GED certification, and life skills (Martin & Inciardi, 1993). Parolees who receive vocational training or have higher employment rates and earnings have lower risk of reoffending (Finn, 1999; Needels, 1996; Seiter & Kadela, 2003). In addition, lack of access to health insurance or other benefits limits released inmates' access to housing, health care, and treatment (Hammett et al., 2001; Nelson & Trone, 2000). Inmates also have poor education: 39% of regular drug users in prison have completed less than 4 years of high school and have no GED (Belenko, 2002a), and only 38% of all inmates received some academic education within prison since their admission (Belenko, 2002a).

In 1999, 1.3 million children had a parent in state prison (Mumola, 2000), with 22% younger than the age of 5. Yet little is known about what happens to the children of incarcerated, substance-involved parents (either while the parent is serving time or subsequent to the parent's reentry into the community). Although there is little research on the causal impact of parental incarceration on a child, family drug use and criminal activity and low levels of parental involvement are risk factors for juvenile substance abuse and delinquency (Loeber & Farrington, 1998) and entry into the juvenile justice system (Farrington, 1998; Sampson & Laub, 1993). Furthermore, communities with high concentrations of incarcerated persons experience damaging losses to overall community social capital, severely affecting stability for children (Clear, Rose, & Ryder, 2001). However, prisons offer few programs to prepare parents to reintegrate with their children, families, or community or improve parenting skills (Petersilia, 2001). Taxman, Young, Byrne, Holsinger, and Anspach (2003) also point to the importance of strengthening family and community support mechanisms for released inmates (Beckerman, 1998), and such support may be a core component of effective drug treatment (National Institute on Drug Abuse [NIDA], 1999).

Substance-involved inmates have social networks comprising peers with high rates of drug use and criminal behavior (Belenko & Peugh, 1999; Friedman, Curtis, Neaigus, Jose, & Des Jarlais, 1999). Peer behavior is an important risk factor for initiation into and maintenance of substance abuse and criminal behavior (Keenan, Loeber, Zhang, Stouthamer-Loeber, & Van Kammen, 1995; Wills & Cleary, 1999). Conversely, association with prosocial peer norms may protect substance-involved offenders from relapse and recidivism (Carvajal et al., 1999; Hoge, Andrews, & Leschied, 1996); social networks must be considered in designing effective parole supervision and service plans. Given that at-risk parolees are likely to belong to a peer

group with lower social status, simply changing peer groups may be difficult (La Greca, Prinstein, & Fetter, 2001). Educating parolees about the risk of peer groups on substance use and criminal behavior may be important, but helping them to gain more positive friendships may be equally critical to sustain treatment effects (McBride, VanderWaal, Terry, & VanBuren, 1999; Prinstein, Boergers, & Spirito, 2001).

Finally, access to affordable, stable, drug-free housing is important for released inmates (Rossi, 1989; Travis et al., 2001). Many inmates face obstacles to finding adequate housing following release because of poor family ties, lack of financial resources for a rental deposit, ineligibility for public housing, or discrimination by landlords (Hammett et al., 2001). Public housing may be denied because of their criminal records or history of drug involvement. Inmates also tend to come from low socioeconomic strata and have relatively high rates of prior homelessness. Among state inmates, 15% of regular drug users were homeless or had no stable housing at the time of their arrest (Belenko, 2002a).

Special needs of female inmates. Although women only make up about 6% of inmates, the number of women in prison has risen by 336% since 1980, compared to a 189% rise for men (Peugh & Belenko, 1999). Although substance-involved women and men in prison share some of the same treatment needs, the manifestations and severity of these needs differ, particularly related to mental and physical health, vocational training, employment, family issues, prenatal and postnatal care, risk of HIV and other infectious diseases, and treatment design (Mahan, 1996; Miller & Downs, 1993; Peugh & Belenko, 1999; Prendergast, Wellisch, & Falkin, 1995; Teplin, Abram, & McClelland, 1996; Wellisch, Prendergast, & Anglin, 1994; Wells & Jackson, 1992). Employment issues have become even more important since the passage of the Federal Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, which limits the length of time an individual is eligible for welfare benefits, requires employment in many cases, and denies benefits to drug-addicted felons. Mental health problems are more likely and distinct for drug-involved female than male inmates (Helzer & Pryzbeck, 1988; Wilcox & Yates, 1993; Windle, Windle, Scheidt, & Miller, 1995). Women who abuse substances often suffer more intense emotional distress, psychosomatic symptoms, depression, and self-esteem problems than males (De Leon & Jainchill, 1982; Falkin et al., 1994; McClellan, Farabee, & Crouch, 1997; Ransom, Schneider, & Robinson-Sanford, 1996). Responsibility for parenting may undermine a woman's ability to participate in postrelease treatment and other services (Richie, Freudenberg, & Page, 2001). Finally, there has been little use of discharge planning or continuity of care for female inmates

(Prendergast et al., 1995), contributing to high rates of recidivism and relapse (Hammett et al., 1998; Veysey, Steadman, Morrissey, & Johnsen, 1997).

Facilitating Successful Reentry and Service Linkages

The preceding discussion suggests that by addressing substance abuse and related problems more effectively by providing evidence-based interventions, public safety, risk management, and treatment outcomes for released inmates would be improved. Considering the multiple risks and service needs for substance-involved inmates, risk-responsivity theory (Andrews & Bonta, 1998; Marlowe, 2003; Thanner & Taxman, 2003) offers a useful framework for understanding the types of assessment mechanisms needed for reentering inmates. This theory includes two key constructs: (a) Outcomes will be improved by identifying risk levels and targeting services specific to those risks, and (2) services need to be targeted to those needs in a way that recognizes the client's current cognitive abilities and learning styles (Thanner & Taxman, 2003). Higher risk clients need a greater intensity of services, and moderate- or low-risk clients need less intensive or comprehensive services (Festinger et al., 2002; Marlowe et al., 2003). In an era of declining resources, strategies to more accurately target scarce services have intuitive and practical appeal. In a direct test of this theory, Thanner and Taxman (2003) found that targeting high-risk probationers with integrated intensive treatment and other services reduced relapse and recidivism and increased employment. The benefits of intensive treatment were much lower for moderate-risk offenders.

Ideally, reentry and reintegration for inmates can be defined as processes that specify appropriate roles and responsibilities for key agencies that house, supervise, and treat the offender before and after release (Travis, 2000). Altschuler, Armstrong, and MacKenzie (1999) identified several factors that improve successful reintegration of adolescent offenders: (a) Agencies responsible for community supervision and service provision must team with corrections to assess needs and risks and facilitate discharge planning; (b) released offenders must have the resources minimally necessary to sustain a livelihood in the community, including housing, employment, and substance abuse services; and (c) community supervision must provide support to facilitate reintegration, including linkage to needed services as well as sufficient external control (monitoring) and compliance management to enforce public safety goals. All of these issues are also quite pertinent for adult substance-involved inmates being released to the community.

The Structured Reentry Model, now being tested in a number of jurisdictions, suggests that two periods are crucial for successful reintegration

(Taxman, Young, & Byrne, 2004). Prior to scheduled release, it is important for a reentry plan to be put in place. Taxman, Byrne, et al. (2003) note that this must involve a comprehensive assessment of treatment, health, housing, family, educational, and vocational needs; the identification of potential community supports (e.g., family members, other community members, organizations, program services); and a supervision plan. Comprehensive and integrated services are needed to achieve long-term success for parolees (Taxman, Young, et al., 2003). Inmates with histories of drug abuse leaving prison with little money, social capital, or community supports face a high likelihood of early relapse and recidivism (Petersilia, 2001; Taxman, Byrne, et al., 2003). An effective reentry supervision plan must provide intensive services and close supervision during this early release period. In this phase, crucial referrals and linkages to treatment and other services must occur, housing must be stabilized, and treatment and supervision plans must be finalized.

This conceptual framework also suggests that proximal factors may be important to consider in understanding the mediators and moderators of reintegration. In addition, intentions and plans (e.g., peer and family supports, housing options) are likely to interact with the management of risk, the impact of service referrals, and parole outcomes. Unfortunately, to date, there are few data to determine the relative importance of proximal versus distal factors for postrelease outcomes.

However, there remain important organizational challenges for facilitating service linkages and agency collaborations. Parole officers have high caseloads that limit their ability to assess for and manage service delivery. Doctrines of retribution, deterrence, and social control have become the dominant models for parole supervision, resulting in an emphasis on monitoring and public safety and low tolerance for violations of supervision conditions. Incentives for parole officers to refer to health and social services are limited, and they often lack training about substance abuse, treatment, and other health services. Given limited resources, parole officers may not have access to computer systems, service directories, or training that can improve their ability to identify community resources and service linkages in an effective and efficient manner. Consequently, service linkages for parolees are likely to be haphazard and inconsistent at best and inappropriate and iatrogenic at worst. Carise, Gurel, Kendig, and McLellan (2002) found that service referrals increase and are more effective when treatment counselors are provided computerized provider directories linked to specific services. Thus, there is a need to create tools that will facilitate access to appropriate and effective services following release. Finally, recent literature on the impacts of legal coercion on treatment retention and outcomes (e.g., Farabee,

Prendergast, & Anglin, 1998; Hiller, Knight, Broome, & Simpson, 1998; Marlowe, 2001; Young & Belenko, 2002) suggest that parole officer involvement in monitoring treatment attendance, accountability structures, and better matched referrals may lead to improved outcomes.

New Approaches Are Beginning to Emerge

Recent attention to prisoner reentry and reintegration and therapeutic jurisprudence models, such as drug courts (Belenko, 2002b; Hora, Schma, & Rosenthal, 1999), has created a new climate that may be more accepting of rehabilitative ideals and the role of health and social services in managing offenders in the community, especially related to substance abuse problems and consequences (Winick, 1999). Unfortunately, much less attention has been paid to prerelease or transitional planning for inmates or the implementation of comprehensive, multidimensional, validated assessment tools to assist in identifying service and supervision needs (Taxman, Byrne, et al., 2003).

Under support from the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) of the Department of Justice, the Reentry Partnership Initiative (RPI) established community-based models for inmate reintegration into the community with the goal of reducing recidivism (Taxman et al., 2004). The model, implemented in eight sites, involved collaborative partnerships among community service providers (e.g., treatment programs, housing agencies) and public agencies responsible for supervising and monitoring offenders (e.g., corrections, parole agencies). The RPI model incorporates a conceptual framework for a reentry process that includes institutional, structured reentry and community reintegration, supported by integrated case management (Taxman et al., 2004). Underlying much of this process is a need for ongoing, individualized assessment of offender risks and needs. However, a recent process analysis of the implementation of the eight RPI sites found that the sites had made little progress in implementing risk and needs assessment protocols (Taxman et al., 2004).

The Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative (SVORI) began in 2002 and was designed to develop inmate reentry processes that are focused on public safety. OJP and the National Institute of Corrections, through a collaboration with and support from other federal agencies, funded 68 sites in 49 states. The goals of the SVORI are to

> increase public safety by reducing recidivism and noncompliance; to improve health by addressing substance abuse and physical and mental health; to improve self-sufficiency through employment, housing, family, and commu-

> nity involvement; and to achieve systems change through multi-agency collaboration and case management. (Lattimore et al., 2004, p. 2)

The SVORI applicants were required to form partnerships between correctional agencies and a local agency, including community- and faith-based organizations (Roman, 2004). Programs were to include phases that addressed (a) institutionally based programs, (b) community-based transition programs, and (c) community-based long-term support. States were provided guidelines for the structure of the three phases; the service delivery systems, including case management, risk and need assessment, preparation of reentry plans, and provision of services; a continuum of supervision and continuity of services; and terms and conditions of the reentry plan. This new initiative suggests that many correctional and parole agencies are beginning to pay increased attention to other service and supervision needs for reentering inmates.

Finally, the NIDA established the Criminal Justice Drug Abuse Treatment Studies (CJDATS) collaborative research program to explore the issues related to the complex system of offender treatment services (www.cjdats.org). Nine research centers and a coordinating center were created in partnership with researchers, criminal justice professionals, and drug abuse treatment practitioners to form a national research infrastructure. CJDATS is intended to spur the development and testing of models for integrated approaches to the treatment of incarcerated individuals with substance use disorders, including treatment in jail or prison, and as a component of reentry into the community.

Better Assessments for Reentry and Service Linkage Are Needed

The research and practice findings discussed above, in the context of risk-responsivity theory, suggest that additional dimensions of drug abuse and its effects need to be assessed for and considered in making clinically appropriate estimates of treatment need (McLellan et al., 1983), in determining intensity of treatment (McLellan & Alterman, 1991), and in crafting appropriate treatment plans (Carise et al., 2002). As Hammett et al. (2001) state, there is an "overarching need for correctional facilities to improve programs for discharge planning, community linkages, and continuity of care for all inmates" (p. 392). The American Society of Addiction Medicine patient placement criteria indicate that behavioral conditions and consequences of drug use (e.g., educational and vocational problems, anger management problems, or motor vehicle accidents) should be taken into account in determining the level of care (Mee-Lee, Shulman, Fishman, Gastfriend, & Griffith, 2001).

Current assessment tools commonly used in correctional settings have limitations for identifying multiple clinical, supervision, and social service needs for this population. Common examples are the Addiction Severity Index (McLellan et al., 1985), the Offender Profile Index (Inciardi, McBride, & Weinman, 1993), the Global Assessment of Individual Needs (Dennis, Titus, White, Unsicker, & Hodgkins, 2002), and the Level of Service Inventory–Revised (Andrews & Bonta, 1995). New assessment tools are needed that

- are validated with inmate populations released to parole;
- include multiple domains tied specifically to the behavioral, health, organizational, and social issues most likely to affect relapse and recidivism in the community;
- have good psychometric properties;
- are designed to serve as risk management and service linkage tools for parole officers; and
- combine static and dynamic factors, covering different time periods, which are important for postrelease success and adjustment (Simourd, 2004).

Typical assessment instrument domains center on specific timeframes (e.g., lifetime versus recent). However, given that incarceration limits an inmate's ability to engage in many behaviors and may alter the antecedents and determinants of risk behaviors, it may be important to incorporate multiple time frames in new assessment tools. Examples are (a) first initiation into behavior and childhood problems or behaviors, (b) behavior just prior to incarceration (e.g., 6 months before admission to prison), (c) behaviors and experiences during incarceration (e.g., mental and physical health, infractions, training and education, treatment and services received), and (d) postrelease plans and intentions (e.g., having a place to live, likelihood of obtaining a job, reunification with family). Experiences while incarcerated may exacerbate prior conditions, so there may be a need to assess for the effects of incarceration itself on health and social functioning and the inmate's ability to successfully reenter society. Recent data indicate that inmates with misconduct infractions have higher recidivism rates after release; parolees in Pennsylvania with one or more misconducts in the year prior to release had a higher rate of return to prison than inmates without infractions (44% vs. 33%; Flaherty, 2004).

In addition, research on reentry and recidivism suggests that additional items are needed in new domains beyond those covered in most existing instruments, such as issues related to intentions, plans, strengths and protective factors, peer supports, and family and community resources (Taxman, Byrne, et al., 2003). Moreover, attributes and behaviors may cluster across

unidimensional domains into higher order factors that are better predictors of postrelease relapse and recidivism. For example, items related to family, peer networks, employment, community supports, and housing might fall into a general social support factor. A personal health domain might incorporate items from medical and psychiatric domains, including psychopathy.

CONCLUSION

In sum, there are several key challenges for improving assessment and service linkages for reentering inmates and maximizing successful reentry for substance-involved inmates. First, prerelease or transitional planning is limited now and rarely based on adequate assessment using research-based instruments (Knight, Simpson, & Hiller, 2002). There is a need to improve transitional planning to identify effective services, to facilitate linkages to services, and to better manage risk in the community. The term *effective referrals* means services that are accessible; are relevant and appropriate to the offender's risk, need, and cognitive ability levels; and provide data and feedback to the parole officer on the offender's progress in meeting service goals. Second, parole officers faced with heavy caseloads and limited training in health and social services are ill equipped to provide appropriate referrals to such services and adequately monitor progress and compliance. The emphasis on control and monitoring means that high parole violation rates and reincarceration are consequences of relapse rather than adjustments of services or rereferral to another provider. Third, existing assessment tools have not been widely adopted; in a survey of correctional psychologists, Boothby and Clements (2000) found that the vast majority of clinicians in correctional facilities ignore risk assessment tools in assessing and treating inmates. Fourth, simply targeting substance abuse problems may be insufficient if other social, behavioral, and health problems mediate and moderate relapse and recidivism following release. Finally, the unique profiles and serious needs of female inmates have not been addressed in previous research or reentry program development.

There are several important reasons for assessing released inmates for current conditions, motivational levels, behavioral status, and beliefs and perceptions related to service needs and access. These include the need to target services that are appropriate to the offender's current cognitive and learning skills (indicated by risk-responsivity theory), the multiple health and social service needs of inmates, the importance of the early release period in a structured reentry model, and the importance of linkages to appropriate services to facilitate reintegration and community supports (Altschuler et al.,

1999). More recent dynamic factors may be more predictive of postrelease adjustment and risk than either static factors or more distal dynamic traits measured prior to incarceration (Simourd, 2004). For example, the Addiction Severity Index includes both the assessment of lifetime functioning and the assessment of recent (acute) problems and functioning. Lifetime information is designed to help the clinician evaluate problem severity and develop treatment plans; acute recent problems are also used for these purposes and are also used to monitor change. These are very different functions. Whereas assessment of lifetime functioning is conceptualized as typically applying to treatment intake and baseline, assessment of acute functioning needs to be applicable at intake and subsequent time points. Accordingly, new frameworks are needed to guide inmate assessment that

- identify areas of functioning and health that require interventions on release;
- assess multiple dimensions, including public safety risk, that have sound psychometric properties, are relatively compact and easy to administer and score, and have clinical utility and acceptability in real-world settings;
- assess for both static and dynamic factors and distinguish recent dynamic behaviors and conditions from more distal conditions;
- include higher order factors that may mediate or moderate postrelease behavior;
- are validated for the reentering inmate population (which have disproportionate percentages of African American, Hispanic, and socially disadvantaged persons);
- will be adopted and used by correctional and parole staff to expand and improve service linkages ("ecological validity");
- are sensitive to the dynamics of the reentry and reintegration processes; and
- include community resource or community strength assessments to determine the social ecology and social capital aspects of the inmate's reintegration (Laverack & Wallerstein, 2001; McKnight & Kretzmann, 1996; Putnam, 1995).

In addition to identifying areas that may require provision of services, a useful assessment instrument would move beyond current instruments and also identify domains and problems that might require additional or modified supervision levels or different conditions of parole and probation (e.g., housing, community supports, peer networks). The ideal assessment instrument should be a standardized tool that can provide data useful for research on postrelease behaviors and service delivery for released inmates and policy efforts to improve the reentry process for reentering inmates. The individual and organizational complexity of the reentry process, coupled with the high level of reoffending risk for substance-involved inmates and their multiple service needs, increases the urgency to develop new tools to help transitional planning staff and parole officers accurately identify service needs for inmates reentering the community. Such new tools are vital for generating a new set of research questions and hypotheses that will increase and deepen

our understanding of the array of factors that determine or mediate post-release outcomes for inmates.

REFERENCES

Altschuler, D., Armstrong, T., & MacKenzie, D. (1999). *Reintegration, supervised release, and intensive aftercare*. Washington, DC: Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. L. (1995). *The Level of Service Inventory–Revised: User's manual*. North Tonawanda, NY: Multi-Health Systems.

Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. L. (1998). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (2nd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Anno, J. (1991). *Prison health care: Guidelines for the management of an adequate delivery system*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections, National Commission on Correctional Health Care.

Beck, A. J., & Mumola, C. J. (1999). *Prisoners in 1998* (Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, NCJ 175687). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Beckerman, A. (1998). Charting a course: Meeting the challenge of permanency planning for children with incarcerated mothers. *Child Welfare*, *77*, 513-529.

Belenko, S. (2000). The challenges of integrating drug treatment into the criminal justice process. *Albany Law Review*, *63*, 833-876.

Belenko, S. (2002a). *Trends in substance abuse and treatment needs among inmates* (final report to the National Institute of Justice). New York: The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University.

Belenko, S. (2002b). Drug courts. In C. G. Leukefeld, F. Tims, & D. Farabee (Eds.), *Treatment of drug offenders: Policies and issues* (pp. 301-318). New York: Springer.

Belenko, S., Foltz, C., Lang, M., & Sung, H.- E. (2004). The impact on recidivism of residential treatment for high-risk drug felons: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, *40*, 105-132.

Belenko, S., Lang, M., & O'Connor, L. (2003). Self-reported psychiatric treatment needs among felony drug offenders. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *19*(1), 9-29.

Belenko, S., Langley, S., Crimmins, S., & Chaple, M. (2004). HIV risk behaviors, knowledge, and prevention among offenders under community supervision: A hidden risk group. *AIDS Education and Prevention*, *16*, 367-385.

Belenko, S., & Peugh, J. (1999). *Behind bars: Substance abuse and America's prison population*. New York: National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University.

Belenko, S., & Peugh, J. (2005). Estimating drug treatment needs among state prison inmates. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, *77*, 269-281.

Boothby, J. L., & Clements, C. B. (2000). A national survey of correctional psychologists. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, *27*, 715-731.

Bradford, J., Greenberg, D. M., & Motayne, G. G. (1992). Substance abuse and criminal behavior. *Clinical Psychiatry*, *15*(3), 605-622.

Braithwaite, R. L., & Arriola, K. R. (2003). Male prisoners and HIV prevention: A call for action ignored. *American Journal of Public Health*, *93*(5), 759-763.

Broner, N., Borum, R., & Gawley, K. (2002). Criminal justice diversion of individuals with co-occurring mental illness and substance use. In G. Landsberg, M. Rock, L. Berg, & A. Smiley

(Eds.), *Serving mentally ill offenders: Challenges and opportunities for mental health professionals* (pp. 83-106). New York: Springer.
Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2002). *Correctional populations in the United States, 1998* (NCJ No. 192929). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
Butzin, C. A., Martin, S. S., & Inciardi, J. A. (2005). Treatment during transition from prison to community and subsequent illicit drug use. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, *28*(4), 351-358.
Carise, D., Gurel, O., Kendig, C., & McLellan, A. T. (2002). *Giving clinical meaning to patient assessment: Technology transfer to improve treatment care planning and service delivery.* Philadelphia: Treatment Research Institute.
Carvajal, S., Parcel, G., Banspach, S., Basen-Engquist, K., Coyle, K., Kirby, D., et al. (1999). Psychosocial predictors of delay of first sexual intercourse by adolescents. *Health Psychology*, *18*(5), 1-10.
Claus, R. E., & Kendleberger, L. R. (2002). Engaging substance abusers after centralized assessment: Predictors of treatment entry and dropout. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, *34*, 25-31.
Clear, T., & Corbett, R. (1999). Community corrections of place. *Perspectives*, *23*, 24-32.
Clear, T., & Rose, D. R. (1999). *When neighbors go to jail: Impact on attitudes about formal and informal social control*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
Clear, T., Rose, D., & Ryder, J. (2001). Incarceration and the community: The problem of removing and returning offenders. *Crime & Delinquency*, *47*, 335-351.
De Leon, G., & Jainchill, N. (1982). Male and female drug abusers: Social psychological status two years after treatment in a therapeutic community. *American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*, *9*, 465-497.
Dennis, M. L., Titus, J. C., White, M. K., Unsicker, J. I., & Hodgkins, D. (2002). *Global Appraisal of Individual Needs (GAIN): Administration guide for the GAIN and related measures*. Bloomington, IL: Chestnut Health Systems. Available at www.chestnut.org/li/gain
Ditton, P. M. (1999). *Mental health and treatment of inmates and probationers: Special report* (Pub. No. NCJ 174463). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
Falkin, G. P., Wellisch, J., Prendergast, M. L., Kilian, T., Hawke, J., & Natarajan, M. (1994). *Drug treatment for women offenders: A systems perspective*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.
Farabee, D., Prendergast, M., & Anglin, M. (1998). The effectiveness of coerced treatment for drug-abusing offenders. *Federal Probation*, *62*, 3-10.
Farrington, D. (1998). Predictors, causes, and correlates of male youth violence. In M. Tonry & M. Moore (Eds.), *Youth violence* (pp. 421-475). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Festinger, D. S., Marlowe, D. B., Lee, P. A., Kirby, K. C., Bovasso, G., & McLellan, A. T. (2002). Status hearings in drug court: When more is less and less is more. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, *68*, 151-157.
Finn, P. (1999). *Washington State's corrections clearinghouse: A comprehensive approach to offender employment* (NCJ 174441). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
Flaherty, R. (2004). *Recidivism in Pennsylvania state correctional institutions, 1996-2001*. Camp Hill: Pennsylvania Department of Corrections.
Friedman, S. R., Curtis, R., Neaigus, A., Jose, B., & Des Jarlais, D. C. (1999). *Social networks, drug injectors' lives, and HIV/AIDS*. New York: Kluwer Academic.
Gastfriend, D. R., & McLellan, A. T. (1997). Treatment matching: Theoretical basis and practical implications. *Medical Clinics of North America*, *81*, 945-966.
Gendreau, P., Little, T., & Goggin, C. (1996). Meta-analysis of the predictors of adult offender recidivism: What works? *Criminology*, *34*, 575-607.

Glaze, L. E., & Palla, S. (2004). *Probation and parole in the United States, 2003* (NCJ 205336). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Goldstein, P. J. (1985). The drugs/violence nexus: A tripartite conceptual framework. *Journal of Drug Issues*, *15*(4), 493-506.

Hammett, T. M., Gaiter, J. L., & Crawford, C. (1998). Reaching seriously at-risk populations: Health interventions in criminal justice settings. *Health Education & Behavior, 25*, 99-120.

Hammett, T. M., Harmon, P., & Maruschak, L. (1999). *1996-1997 update: HIV, AIDS, STDs, and TB in correctional facilities*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Hammett, T. M., Roberts, C., & Kennedy, S. (2001). Health-related issues in prisoner reentry. *Crime & Delinquency*, *47*, 390-409.

Harrison, P. M., & Beck, A. J. (2004). *Prisoners in 2003* (NCJ 205335). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Harrison, P. M., & Karberg, J. C. (2004). *Prison and jail inmates at midyear 2003* (NCJ 203947). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Helzer, J. E., & Pryzbeck, T. R. (1988). The co-occurrence of alcoholism with other psychiatric disorders in the general population and its impact on treatment. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, *49*, 219-224.

Hiller, M., Knight, K., Broome, K., & Simpson, D. (1998). Legal pressure and treatment retention in a national sample of long-term residential programs. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, *25*, 463-481.

Hoff, R. A., & Rosenheck, R. A. (1999). The cost of treating substance abuse patients with and without comorbid psychiatric disorders. *Psychiatric Services*, *50*, 1309-1315.

Hoge, R., Andrews, D., & Leschied, A. (1996). An investigation of risk and protective factors in a sample of youthful offenders. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *37*(4), 419-424.

Hora, P. F., Schma, W. G., & Rosenthal, J. T. A. (1999). Therapeutic jurisprudence and the drug treatment court movement: Revolutionizing the criminal justice system's response to drug abuse and crime in America. *Notre Dame Law Review*, *74*, 439-538.

Hser, Y.- I., Polinsky, M. L., Maglione, M., & Anglin, M. D. (1999). Matching clients' needs with drug treatment services. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, *16*, 299-305.

Inciardi, J. A., Martin, S. S., & Butzin, C. A. (2004). Five-year outcomes of therapeutic community treatment of drug-involved offenders after release from prison. *Crime & Delinquency*, *50*(1), 88-107.

Inciardi, J. A., McBride, D. C., & Weinman, B. A. (1993). *The Offender Profile Index: A user's guide*. Washington, DC: National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Directors.

Keenan, K., Loeber, R., Zhang, Q., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., & Van Kammen, W. (1995). The influence of deviant peers on the development of boys' disruptive and delinquent behavior: A temporal analysis. *Development and Psychopathology*, *7*, 715-726.

Knight, K., Simpson, D. D., & Hiller, M. L. (2002). Screening and referral for substance-abuse treatment in the criminal justice system. In C. G. Leukefeld, F. Tims, & D. Farabee (Eds.), *Treatment of drug offenders: Policies and issues* (pp. 259-272). New York: Springer.

La Greca, A., Prinstein, M., & Fetter, M. (2001). Adolescent peer crowd affiliation: Linkages with health-risk behaviors and close friendships. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, *26*(3), 131-143.

Lamb, H. R., & Weinberger, L. E. (1998). Persons with severe mental illness in jails and prisons: A review. *Psychiatric Services*, *49*, 483-492.

Lang, M., & Belenko, S. (2000). Predicting retention in a residential drug treatment alternative to prison program. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, *19*, 145-160.

Langan, P. A., & Levin, D. J. (2002). *Recidivism of prisoners released in 1994* (NCJ 193427). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice.

Lattimore, P. K., Brumbaugh, S., Visher, C., Lindquist, C., Winterfield, L., Salas, M., et al. (2004). *National portrait of SVORI*. Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International.

Laub, J. H., & Sampson, R. J. (2001). Understanding desistance from crime. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and justice* (pp. 1-69). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Laverack, G., & Wallerstein, N. (2001). Measuring community empowerment: A fresh look at organizational domains. *Health Promotion International*, *16*, 170-185.

Leukefeld, C., McDonald, H. S., Staton, M., & Mateyoke-Scrivner, A. (2004). Employment, employment-related problems, and drug use at drug court entry. *Substance Use and Misuse*, *39*, 2559-2579.

Loeber, R., & Farrington, D. (1998). *Serious and violent juvenile offenders: Risk factors and successful interventions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mahan, S. (1996). *Crack cocaine, crime, and women*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Marlowe, D. B. (2001). Coercive treatment of substance abusing criminal offenders. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice*, *1*, 65-73.

Marlowe, D. B. (2003). Integrating substance abuse treatment and criminal justice supervision. *National Institute on Drug Abuse Science & Practice Perspectives*, *2*, 4-14.

Marlowe, D. B., Festinger, D. S., Lee, P. A., Schepise, M. M., Hazzard, J. E. R., Merrill, J. C., et al. (2003). Are judicial status hearings a key component of drug court? During-treatment data from a randomized trial. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, *30*, 141-162.

Marquart, J., Merianos, D., Hebert, J., & Carroll, L. (1997). Health conditions and prisoners: A review of research and emerging areas of inquiry. *The Prison Journal*, *77*(2), 184-208.

Martin, S. S., Butzin, C. A., Saum, S. A., & Inciardi, J. A. (1999). Three-year outcomes of therapeutic community treatment for drug-involved offenders in Delaware. *The Prison Journal*, *79*, 294-320.

Martin, S. S., & Inciardi, J. (1993). Case management approaches for criminal justice clients. In J. Inciardi (Ed.), *Drug treatment and criminal justice* (pp. 81-96). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Martin, S. S., O'Connell, D. J., Inciardi, J. A., Beard, R. A., & Surratt, H. L. (2003). HIV/AIDS among probationers: An assessment of risk and results from a brief intervention. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, *35*, 435-443.

Mattson, M. E., Allen, J. P., Longabaugh, R., Nickless, C. J., Connors, G. J., & Kadden, R. M. (1994). A chronological review of empirical studies matching alcoholic clients to treatment. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, *12*(suppl.), 16-29.

McBride, D., VanderWaal, C., Terry, Y., & VanBuren, H. (1999). *Breaking the cycle of drug use among juvenile offenders. Final technical report* (NCJ 179273). Retrieved August 18, 2005, from http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/179273.pdf

McClellan, D. S., Farabee, D., & Crouch, B. M. (1997). Early victimization, drug use, and criminality: A comparison of male and female prisoners. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, *24*, 455-476.

McKnight, J., & Kretzmann, J. (1996). *Mapping community capacity*. Evanston, IL: Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University.

McLellan, A. T., & Alterman, A. I. (1991). Patient treatment matching: A conceptual and methodological review with suggestions for future research. In *NIDA Research Monograph No. 106* (pp. 114-135). Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institute on Drug Abuse.

McLellan, A. T., Arndt, I. O., Metzger, D. S., & O'Brien, C. P. (1993). The effects of psychosocial services in substance abuse treatment. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, *269*, 1953-1959.

McLellan, A. T., Luborsky, L., Cacciola, J., Griffith, J., Evans, F., Barr, H. L., et al. (1985). New data from the Addiction Severity Index: Reliability and validity in three centers. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, *173*, 412-423.

McLellan, A. T., Luborsky, L., Woody, G. E., O'Brien, C. P., & Druley, K. A. (1983). Predicting response to alcohol and drug abuse treatment. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *40*, 620-625.

Mee-Lee, D., Shulman, G., Fishman, M., Gastfriend, D. R., & Griffith, J. H. (Eds.). (2001). *ASAM patient placement criteria for the treatment of substance-related disorders: Second edition–revised* (ASAM PPC-2R). Chevy Chase, MD: American Society of Addiction Medicine.

Melnick, G., De Leon, G., Thomas, G., & Kressel, D. (2001). A client-treatment matching protocol for therapeutic communities: First report. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, *21*, 119-128.

Miller, B. A., & Downs, W. R. (1993). The impact of family violence on the use of alcohol by women. *Alcohol, Health and Research World*, *17*(2), 137-143.

Mumola, C. (1998). *Substance abuse and treatment of adults on probation, 1995* (NCJ 166611). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Mumola, C. (2000). *Incarcerated parents and their children* (NCJ 182335). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

National Institute on Drug Abuse. (1999). *Principles of drug addiction treatment*. Rockville, MD: National Institutes of Health.

Needels, K. E. (1996). Go directly to jail and do not collect? A long-term study of recidivism, employment, and earnings patterns among prison releases. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *33*, 471-496.

Nelson, M., & Trone, J. (2000). *Why planning for release matters*. New York: Vera Institute of Justice.

Peters, R. H., & Murrin, M. R. (2000). Effectiveness of treatment-based drug courts in reducing criminal recidivism. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, *27*, 72-96.

Petersilia, J. (2001). Prisoner reentry: Public safety and reintegration challenges. *The Prison Journal*, *81*, 360-376.

Peugh, J., & Belenko, S. (1999). Substance-involved women inmates: Challenges to providing effective treatment. *The Prison Journal*, *79*, 23-44.

Platt, J. L. (1995). Vocational rehabilitation of drug abusers. *Psychological Review*, *117*, 416-433.

Prendergast, M. L., Hall, E. A., Wexler, H. K., Melnick, G., & Cao, Y. (2004). Amity prison-based therapeutic community: 5-year outcomes. *The Prison Journal*, *84*(1), 36-60.

Prendergast, M. L., Wellisch, J., & Falkin, G. P. (1995). Assessment of and services for substance-abusing women offenders in community and correctional settings. *The Prison Journal*, *75*, 240-256.

Prinstein, M., Boergers, J., & Spirito, A. (2001). Adolescents' and their friends' health-risk behavior: Factors that alter or add to peer influence. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, *26*(5), 287-298.

Project MATCH Research Group. (1998). Matching alcoholism treatment to client heterogeneity: Project MATCH three-year drinking outcomes. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*, *22*, 1300-1311.

Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy*, *6*, 65-78.

Ransom, G., Schneider, J., & Robinson-Sanford, K. P. (1996). Drug dependent women in Boot Camp programs: Practical considerations. *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly*, *14*(2), 79-87.

Reif, S., Horgan, C. M., Ritter, G. A., & Tompkins, C. P. (2004). The impact of employment counseling on substance user treatment participation and outcomes. *Substance Use and Misuse*, *39*, 2391-2424.

Richie, B. E., Freudenberg, N., & Page, J. (2001). Reintegrating women leaving jail into urban communities: A description of a model program. *Journal of Urban Health*, *78*, 290-303.

Roman, C. G. (2004). A roof is not enough: Successful prisoner reintegration requires experimentation and collaboration. *Criminology and Public Policy*, *3*, 161-168.

Rossi, P. H. (1989). *Down and out in America: Origins of homelessness*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rychtarik, R., Connors, G. J., Whitney, R. B., McGillicuddy, N. B., Fitterling, J. M., & Wirtz, P. W. (2000). Treatment settings for persons with alcoholism: Evidence for matching clients to inpatient versus outpatient care. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *68*, 277-289.

Sampson, R., & Laub, J. (1993). *Crime in the making: Pathways and turning points through life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Seiter, R. P., & Kadela, K. R. (2003). Prisoner reentry: What works, what does not, and what is promising. *Crime & Delinquency*, *49*, 360-388.

Simourd, D. J. (2004). Use of dynamic risk/need assessment instruments among long-term incarcerated offenders. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, *31*, 306-323.

Simpson, D. D., Joe, G. W., Fletcher, B. W., Hubbard, R. L., & Anglin, M. D. (1999). A national evaluation of treatment outcomes for cocaine dependence. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *56*, 510-514.

Sung, H.- E. (2003). Differential impact of deterrence vs. rehabilitation as drug interventions on recidivism after 36 months. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, *37*, 95-108.

Taxman, F. (1998). *Recidivism reduction through a seamless system of care: Components of effective treatment, supervision and transition services in the community.* Washington, DC: Office of National Drug Control Policy.

Taxman, F. S., Byrne, J. M., & Young, D. (2003). *Targeting for reentry: Matching needs and services to maximize public safety.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Taxman, F., Young, D., & Byrne, J. (2004). Transforming offender reentry into public safety: Lessons from OJP's Reentry Partnership Initiative. *Justice Policy and Research*, *5*, 101-128.

Taxman, F. S., Young, D., Byrne, J. M., Holsinger, A., & Anspach, D. (2003). *From prison safety to public safety: Innovations in offender reentry.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Teplin, L. A., Abram, K. M., & McClelland, G. M. (1996). Prevalence of psychiatric disorders among incarcerated women. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *53*, 505-512.

Thanner, M. H., & Taxman, F. S. (2003). Responsivity: The value of providing intensive services to high-risk offenders. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, *24*, 137-147.

Thornton, C. C., Gottheil, E., Weinstein, S. P., & Kerachsky, R. S. (1998). Patient-treatment matching in substance abuse: Drug addiction severity. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, *15*, 505-511.

Tonry, M. H., & Wilson, J. Q. (Eds.). (1990). *Drugs and crime*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Travis, J. (2000). *But they all come back: Rethinking prisoner reentry.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Travis, J., Solomon, A. L., & Waul, M. (2001). *From prison to home: The dimensions and consequences of prisoner reentry.* Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Veysey, B. M., Steadman, H. J., Morrissey, J. P., & Johnsen, M. (1997). In search of the missing linkages: Continuity of care in U.S. jails. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, *15*, 383-397.

Wellisch, J., Prendergast, M. L., & Anglin, M. D. (1994). *Drug-abusing women offenders: Results of a national survey. Research in brief*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

Wells, D. V. B., & Jackson, J. F. (1992). HIV and chemically dependent women: Recommendations for appropriate health care and drug treatment services. *International Journal of the Addictions*, *27*, 571-585.

Wilcox, J. A., & Yates, W. R. (1993). Gender and psychiatric comorbidity in substance abusing individuals. *American Journal on Addictions*, *2*(3), 202-206.

Wills, T., & Cleary, S. (1999). Peer and adolescent substance use among 6th-9th graders: Latent growth analyses of influence versus selection mechanisms. *Health Psychology*, *18*, 453-463.

Windle, M., Windle, R. C., Scheidt, D. M., & Miller, G. B. (1995). Physical and sexual abuse and associated mental disorders among alcoholic patients. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *152*(9), 1322-1328.

Winick, B. J. (1999). Redefining the role of the criminal defense lawyer at plea bargaining and sentencing: A therapeutic jurisprudence/preventive law model. *Psychology, Public Policy, & Law*, *5*, 1034-1083.

Young, D., & Belenko, S. (2002). Program retention and perceived coercion in three models of mandatory drug treatment. *Journal of Drug Issues*, *32*(1), 297-328.

Zhang, Z. (2004). *Drug and alcohol use and related matters among arrestees, 2003*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.