Amanda Michel

The Effect of La Crosse County Drug Court on Recidivism Using a Group of Participants and Non-participants

SOC 405 Quantitative Social Research Seminar

Spring 2008

Professor Delgado

ABSTRACT

This study looked at the effectiveness of the La Crosse County Drug Court on reducing recidivism among its participants in comparison to a control group. It was hypothesized that participants of the La Crosse County Drug Court are less likely to be re-arrested for a felony and misdemeanor crime than the control group. Data was collected from the drug court files and a National Crime Information Center (NCIC) for re-arrest statistics. A correlation analysis was conducted and found that graduates are significantly less likely to be re-arrested for a felony crime than the control group and the population of participants that were expelled from the program without completion. Furthermore, the correlation analysis found that the expelled population was less likely to be re-arrested for a misdemeanor crime than the control group. These results show that Drug Court is effective in reducing recidivism among its participants. However, a logistic regression analysis found that when controlling for demographics the relationship between graduates and recidivism becomes reversed and the control population is less likely to recidivate. The results for this program evaluation have been mixed, but the outcome for the La Crosse County Drug Court is positive.

Drug Courts were established in this country during a time when high rates of drug abuse and equally high rates of incarceration were challenging the criminal justice system. Drug courts are designed to reduce recidivism and lead participants to a healthy and more productive life. In order to make this possible, drug courts combine highly intensive supervision with substance abuse treatment (Kalich and Evans 2006). Drug Court participants are required

to meet with the judge on a weekly or bi-weekly basis, they must take random drug and alcohol tests and abide by the drug court rules and regulations. Drug courts are designed to help high risk clients that have a history of substance abuse. Specifically, drug courts work on a system of graduated sanctions and rewards, designed to motivate the participant to work towards the goal of rehabilitation.

The current research will look at the recidivism rates of the La Crosse County Drug Courts by the individual's status in the program, length of time spent in the program, overall LSI scores, the subgroups of the LSI score, and their demographic characteristics, including age, gender and race. For this research, recidivism refers to whether or not the participant was re-arrested for any crime felony or misdemeanor. The La Crosse County Drug Court team decided that the re-arrest rates are a sufficient enough way to determine recidivism rates. This project looks at the effectiveness of the La Crosse County Drug Court, and the specific characteristics of a successful drug court participant. The purpose of this research is to determine if the La Crosse County Drug Court is successful in reducing criminality and substance abuse lifestyles within the population of drug court participants. This research will help the La Crosse County Drug Court determine future outcomes for its participants. Furthermore, the outcome of this research will help in the development of any new techniques and the education of old techniques for the drug court team.

Literature Review

Status in the Program

Drug courts have been found to significantly reduce recidivism in its participants compared to a group of non-participants (Kalich and Evans 2006; Peters, Haas and Hunt 2001;

Peters and Murrin 2000). Furthermore, drug court graduates are increasingly less likely to recidivate than participants that did not graduate from the program (Wolfe, Guydish and Termondt 2002). According to Kalich and Evans' research on the 15th Judicial District of Louisiana Drug Court, 12 months after graduating from the drug court, graduates recidivism rate was 40.7% compared to a rate of 55.0% for the control group and 82.5% for participants of drug court that were terminated from the program (2006). Although these results for the graduates are high compared to other research in the field, the results still indicate a significant relationship between graduation from the drug court and lowering of recidivism rates.

Research on the Hamilton County Drug Court used 301 drug court participants and 224 control subjects to determine recidivism rates. This study concluded that 32% of the drug court participants and 37% of the individuals from the control group were rearrested. Although these results are not entirely significant, researchers found was significance in the type of offense committed by each of the groups. The drug court sample was more likely to be arrested for a conduct or disorder crime, while the control group was more likely to commit a property crime (Listwan et al 2003). This research could indicate an area which needs to be addressed by the treatment provider regarding individualized treatment.

The Douglas County Drug Court study compared rates of re-arrest for drug court participants with offenders in the felony drug diversion program and individuals arrested for felony drug offenses that were traditionally handled in the criminal justice system (Spohn et al. 2001). This study found drug court participants were less likely than felony drug arrest people and more likely than diversion participants to recidivate, with rates of 42.1%, 60.8% and 28.9%

respectively. Furthermore, when the researchers in this study decided to control for LSI score (used to assess risk/needs for the offender), the differences between the drug court participants and the diversion participants disappeared. Individuals with felony drug arrests never had an LSI interview score, so they were not used in this test (Spohn et al. 2001).

Length of time in program

There has been relatively little research conducted on the length of time the participant is in the program and its relationship to recidivism. Some research suggests that the longer the time in the program the less likely the participant is to recidivate (Peters, Haas and Hunt 2001; Peters and Murrin 2000). According to research by Peters and Murrin, the length of time a participant was involved with drug court negatively correlates with arrest rates (2000). For example, Peters and Murrin found that graduates had 51.8 re-arrests per 100, while non-graduates that were only in the program for 1 to 90 days had a 238.7 re-arrests per 100 (2000). Furthermore, Peters, Haas and Hunt found that participants who did not graduate from drug court, but spent at least nine months in the program had lower arrest rates 12 months after program termination than non-graduates that were terminated after only three months in the program (2001).

There are some limitations on the research regarding length of time in the program. For instance, Peters and Murrin's research only focused on those individuals that completed or were terminated from the program in less than one year (2000). Peters and Murrin concluded that the more time a non-graduate spent in the program the less likely they would be to

recidivate, but questioned the effectiveness of the program if the participant does not graduate and does not get terminated from the program after one year (2000).

Level of Service Inventory (LSI) Scores

Many drug courts use a questionnaire or instrument in order to assess the risk/need of each of the individual clients (Mills, Kroner and Hemmati 2003). The La Crosse County Drug Court as well as many others use the Level of Service Inventory (LSI) to assess clients before they enter into the drug court admission process. The purpose of this tool is to determine the amount and kind of supervision that is necessary to meet each individuals needs (Mills, Kroner and Hemmati 2003). The LSI scores range from 1 being very low risk/need to 54 being extremely high risk/need (Andrews and Bonta 1995). The LSI consists of ten subgroups including: Criminal History, Education/Employment, Financial, Family/Marital, Accommodation, Leisure/Recreation, Companions, Alcohol/Drug Problems, Emotional/Personal, and Attitudes and Orientation (Mills, Kroner and Hemmati 2003).

Mills, Kroner and Hemmati conducted a study, in which, they tested the validity of the LSI by using 209 volunteer adult males that had been recently released from jail or prison and giving them LSI interviews and using re-arrest data after two years of their release (2003). The findings demonstrate a significant relationship between the overall LSI score and general recidivism. Furthermore, many of the subgroups individually had a significant relationship to likelihood of recidivism (Mills, Kroner and Hemmati 2003). These subgroups were criminal history, education/employment, financial, family/marital, companions, and alcohol/drug problems (Mills, Kroner and Hemmati 2003).

Additionally, Girard and Wormith conducted a similar study using incarcerated offenders and probationers to test the validity of the LSI (2004). Girard and Wormith found that offenders that had re-offended after a follow-up period scored higher on the LSI than those that did not re-offend after the follow-up (2004). Moreover, this study found that within the total population of incarcerated and probation offenders, criminal history, companions and pro-criminal attitudes (attitudes and orientation) most closely correlated with recidivism (Girard and Wormith 2004). Overall, the research has shown that LSI is the more predictive of recidivism than any other form of measurement used by treatment and criminal justice programs (Girard and Wormith 2004).

Age, Gender and Race

Demographics such as age, gender and race have a big impact in predicting the level of recidivism. According to Spohn and her colleagues in the study of the Douglas County Drug Court in Nebraska, "older offenders are less likely than younger offenders to be rearrested for either a misdemeanor or a felony, whereas males are more likely than females to be rearrested (162)." Furthermore, this study found that race had no significance when compared to re-arrest rates (Spohn et al. 2001). Kalich and Evans in the their study of the Louisiana Drug Court also found age to be negatively correlated with re-arrest rates, however they found race to be significant stating that whites are less likely than non-whites to recidivate (Kalich and Evans 2006). Furthermore, research done on the San Mateo County Drug Court in California found participants that females and older participants to be less likely to recidivate than males and

younger participants (Wolfe, Guydish and Termondt 2002). These variables will be used as controls in the current research.

Theory

The research for drug courts is best supported by Social Control theory. Control theory in its basic form states that people are controlled by the consequences that could result from deviant behavior. This theory states that all people have the natural desire to deviate, but only those with weakened or strained social bonds actually deviate (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1995). Drug courts are designed to essentially control the participant's life, making their bond with conventional society stronger. Drug courts require the participant to attend meetings, which creates a bond with the recovering community. Also, drug courts require that participants are employed for long periods of time, increasing the bond to conventional society (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1995). In addition to rehabilitating the offender from criminality and drug use, the goals of the drug court are to increase the quality of life for the offender.

Gilmore, Rodriguez and Webb (2005) conducted research regarding the impact of social bonds on program retention for the Maricopa County Juvenile Drug Courts. They found that juveniles that had school problems were significantly less likely to complete the program than those without school problems. Furthermore, having a sibling or peers using drugs significantly reduces the likelihood that the juvenile will become delinquents, as well as prior drug use, parents' drug use and gang membership (Gilmore, Rodriguez, and Webb 2005). Although this research pertains to juveniles the implications can be drawn to the adult population. The purpose of the LSI is to see what areas for the individual are the most in need of attention.

Then the drug court team is able to create a specific treatment plan for each participant. The drug court is designed to correct the thinking of the individual by using their control, therefore strengthening their bonds to society.

Hypotheses

If the research hypothesis were supported, it would suggest that participation in drug court will reduce the likelihood of recidivism. The number of arrests for drug court participants is lower than for non-participants, and more significantly the drug courts graduates are even less likely to recidivate than non-graduates (Wolfe, Guydish, and Termondt 2002). If the null hypothesis were supported, it would suggest that status in the program would have no effect on recidivism rates.

If the research hypothesis were supported, it would suggest that the length of time spent in the program would reduce the likelihood of recidivism. Research has shown that the longer a participant spends in drug court the less likely they would be to recidivate (Kalich and Evans 2006). If the null hypothesis were supported, it would suggest that length of time in the program will have no effect on the rate of recidivism.

If the research hypothesis were supported, it would suggest that being older will decrease the rates of recidivism. According to control theory, crimes rates are at their highest in teenage years and slowly decrease as the individual gets older (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1995). If the null hypothesis were supported, it would suggest that the age of the participants will have no effect on the rates of recidivism.

If the research hypothesis were supported, it would suggest that males are more likely to recidivate than females. The research of the San Mateo County Drug Court, found that being a female reduced the likelihood of recidivism (Wolfe, Guydish and Termondt 2002). If the null hypothesis were supported, it would suggest that gender has no effect on the likelihood of recidivism.

If the research hypothesis were supported, it would suggest that whites are less likely than non-whites to recidivate. Kalich and Evans (2006) found that after a nine month follow-up period for the Louisiana Drug Court, minorities are more likely to be rearrested than whites. If the null hypothesis were supported, it would suggest that race will have no impact on the rates of recidivism.

If the research hypothesis were supported, it would suggest that the higher the score on the LSI the more likely the participant is to recidivate. Girard and Wormith (2004) used LSI scores as a predicator of recidivism in their study of incarcerated offender and probationers, and found that recidivists scored higher on the overall LSI scores and each of the sub-groups than non-recidivists. If the null hypothesis were supported, it would suggest that LSI scores will have no effect on recidivism rates.

DATA AND METHODS

Unit of Analysis

I will be analyzing the participants of the La Crosse County Drug Court since its start in 2001 in regards to recidivism. I will also be using a control group that was collected from referrals to drug court.

Population

The sampling population that I will be using is 88 participants of drug court. Of these 88 participants 27 are graduates of drug court, 31 have been expelled from drug court and 30 are current participants. I will also be including a control sample of 71 people. These people have been matched to the participants based on demographics, such as age, sex and race. Also, they have been matched to the participants as closely as possible by using criminal history and drug of choice. Most of the controls used are from a group of people that were referred to drug court, but either were not accepted or chose not to participant. Of the 88 participants, 35 (40%) are female and 53 (60%) are male, 13 (14.7%) are African American, 2 (2.3%) are Native American, 1 (1.1%) is Hispanic, and 72 (81.8%) are white.

Data Sources

When an offender is referred to drug court the coordinator conducts an interview of the referral, by using the Level of Service Inventory (LSI). The data for age, gender, race and LSI scores has been gathered from the files for each participant or non-participant. The length of time in the program has been calculated by determining how many months, if any, the participant spent in the program. Additionally, status of the program was found within the files retained by the drug court. Rates of recidivism have been collected from the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) by the district attorney's office which has access to this data. All of the data is analyzed via SPSS.

Measures

The dependent variable for this research is recidivism. Recidivism is determined from the National Crime Information Center for each of the participants and non-participants. There are two measures of recidivism, felony or misdemeanor re-arrests (coded as 0= no, 1=yes). The main independent variable is status in the program (0=control, 1=graduate, 2=current, 3=expelled). Length of time in the program is measured using an open ended variable calculated by the number of months spent in the program. Also, demographic variables are used, such as age (open ended variable), gender (0=male, 1= female) and race (0=white, 1=African American, 2= Latino (a), 3= Asian, 4= Native American, and 5= other).

Scores from the LSI are used for an independent variable (coded as 0=lowest risk/lowest needs through 54=highest risk/highest need). Furthermore, I use the sub-categories of the LSI as a predictor of recidivism. These categories include criminal history, education/employment, financial, accommodation, leisure/recreation time, companions, substance abuse, emotional/personal, and attitudes/orientation. Each of these categories is coded according to their specific scores, for instance criminal history has 10 points total (coded as 0=lowest through 10=highest).

Statistical Analysis

A quantitative analysis of the data using univariate (e.g. frequencies), bivariate (e.g. correlations), and multivariate (e.g. logistic regression) analyses was conducted to test the research hypothesis. The research upholds the ethics of the American Sociological Association guidelines for the protection of human subjects.

Study Limitations

Using a control group of referrals to drug court that were not accepted or opted out of the program is a limitation to this research. Generally, a person that is not accepted into the program did not meet the eligibility requirements for admission into drug court. However, the referrals used in this research are those in which passed the initial assessment by the coordinator. For instance, if the person being referred by another agency has a violent conviction on his/her record, that person would not be considered for drug court. Although the referrals were not accepted into the program for various reasons, I chose to use the referrals for a control based on the fact that each of these referrals matches most closely to the population that I study.

A major limitation to this study is the small sample size. Since there have only been 88 participants of the La Crosse County Drug Court since its start, there can be no real conclusions drawn from such a small sample size. Since there is such a small population size, everyone that entered into drug court had to be used regardless of how long they had been in the program or how long they have been out of the program. Therefore, the length of time out of the program for the graduates and expelled population is varied ranging from five years to a couple months out of the program. Ideally, a program evaluation would track each participant for a set amount of time out of the program, such as one year since graduation. Since some participants have only been out of the program for a couple of months, their amount of time to recidivate was shorter giving them an advantage over those who have been out of the program for years.

RESULTS

Descriptive

Table 1 represents the descriptives for the entire population used in this study. A majority of the population did not have a felony re-arrest, while a smaller majority did not have a misdemeanor re-arrest. Table 2 represents the descriptives for each of the categories of the status variable, such as control, graduate and expelled participants. The graduate population was the least likely to be re-arrested for a felony with a rate of 10.7%, followed far behind by the controls then the expelled populations, with 36.2 and 36.7% respectively. Interestingly, the expelled population was the least likely to have a misdemeanor re-arrest, followed by the graduates then the control group.

Tables 1 and 2 about here

The average length of time that a graduate and an expelled client stayed in the drug court is relatively the same. The average age of a graduate is higher than all other groups, at 38.96. The control group average age is 33.24 and the expelled population is 32.5. Although the entire sample was about 60% male and 40% female, the graduates had a different result with 75% of graduates being male and 25% were female. The population for drug court was about 80% white and 15% African American and a small percentage of other races. However, the graduate population was slightly more likely to be white and less likely to be African America.

In regards to LSI scores the average score for the entire study was 23.55 out of a 54 point scale. Predictably, the graduates had the lowest average overall score, while the expelled population had the highest. The same pattern is found when comparing the criminal history,

education/employment, companions and financial sub-scores. However, the substance abuse category showed that the graduates and control group had roughly the same average, while the expelled population had a slightly higher average. The control group had the highest average for the attitudes/orientation, followed by the expelled and then the control population. This is not surprising as the research indicates that the attitude section is the most likely to associate with re-arrest.

Bivariate Analysis

Correlation analysis was used to determine the relationship between each of the dependent variables and the independent variables.

Table 2 about here

Hypothesis 1. The first hypothesis states that participation in drug court will reduce the likelihood of recidivism. In order to analyze this data, the status of the participants and non-participants needed to be looked at individually to see if the reduction in recidivism rates occurred. First, the graduates were compared with the control sample and a significant negative relationship was found for felony recidivism. This shows that graduates are significantly less likely to be arrested for a felony than the control group; however no significant relationship was found for misdemeanor recidivism. Second, the control group was compared to the expelled population and a significant negative relationship was found for misdemeanor recidivism. This shows that the expelled population is significantly less likely to be arrested for a misdemeanor than the control group; however, no significant difference was found for felony recidivism. Lastly, the graduate population and the expelled population were compared and

found that there is a significant positive correlation for felony recidivism. This shows that the graduates are significantly less likely to be arrested for a felony than the expelled population; however, no significant difference was found for misdemeanor recidivism.

Hypothesis 2. The correlation analysis showed that there was no significant relationship between the length of time that was spent in the program and the likelihood of recidivism. However, this relationship may change when the status variable is controlled for.

Hypothesis 3. There is a significant negative relationship between age and misdemeanor recidivism. This shows that the older the person is the less likely they would be to be arrested for a misdemeanor; however, there was no significant relationship for felony recidivism and age.

Hypothesis 4. Gender of the participant or non-participant had no significant relationship with recidivism rates either felony or misdemeanor.

Hypothesis 5. There is not a significant relationship between recidivism and race, when comparing whites to non-whites.

Hypothesis 6. The correlation analysis found no significant relationship between total LSI score and recidivism rates. Furthermore, when the comparing the sub-scores of the LSI to recidivism only one was found to have a significant relationship. The sub-category "financial" showed a significant negative correlation with misdemeanor recidivism. This shows that the higher a participant scores on the financial section of the LSI the more likely they would be arrested for a misdemeanor; however, no significance was found for felony recidivism. The higher the score

on the financial section means the participant has a large problem with financial issues. Criminal history, education/employment, family/marital, accommodation, leisure/recreation, companions, substance abuse, emotional/personal and attitudes/orientation LSI sub-scores all showed no significant relationship with recidivism; either felony or misdemeanor.

Multivariate Analysis

A logistic regression analysis was conducted for both the felony and misdemeanor recidivism dependent variables. Logistic regression analysis of the likelihood of a felony re-arrest is explored in Tables 4, 5 and 6. Table 4 shows the logistic regression using the felony recidivism variable with the independent variables, including all of the LSI sub-scores. Using a significance level of .05, only the LSI sub-scores of accommodation and companions were significant. For the accommodation sub-score, the logistic regression shows that for every point increase in this sub-score the participant is 5 ½ times more likely to be re-arrested for a felony crime. Furthermore, for every point increase in the companions sub-score the participant is almost twice as likely to be re-arrested for a felony crime.

Table 4 about here

Table 5 represents the logistic regression for felony recidivism with total LSI score being used without the sub-scores. This analysis shows no statistical significance for any of the independent variables. Additionally, Table 6 is a logistic regression for felony recidivism with only controlling for the demographics, such as age, race and gender. When only controlling for these variables, status in the program for graduates and controls became significant. This

analysis shows that controls are 1/5th less likely to be re-arrested for a felony crime than the graduate population. No other variables were significant in this analysis.

Tables 5 and 6 about here

Logistic regression analysis of the likelihood of a misdemeanor re-arrest is explored in Tables 7, 8 and 9. Table 7 is a logistic regression for misdemeanor recidivism using the LSI sub-scores. Only the sub-score of financial had any significant impact on misdemeanor recidivism. This table shows that for every point increase in the financial sub-score participants are 1/6th less likely to be re-arrested for a misdemeanor crime.

Table 7 about here

Once again, Table 8 is a logistic regression using misdemeanor recidivism with the total LSI score. Interestingly, in this regression age and race become a significant predictor of misdemeanor recidivism. This table shows that for every year increase in age the participant is 9/10ths less likely to be re-arrested for a misdemeanor crime than a person one year younger. Furthermore, whites are almost four times less likely to be re-arrested for a misdemeanor than non-whites. Table 9 compares misdemeanor recidivism with the demographics of age, race and gender. This analysis shows that graduates are three times less likely to be re-arrested for a misdemeanor crime than the expelled population. Furthermore, under this analysis age and race remain significant predictors of misdemeanor recidivism.

Tables 8 and 9 about here

DISCUSSION

The correlation analysis found important implications for the effectiveness of the La Crosse County Drug Court. This research found that graduates were significantly less likely to be re-arrested for a felony crime than the control group. This finding shows that when participants are successful in drug court they are less likely to recidivate than those that have not had any exposure to drug court. Furthermore, graduates are also significantly less likely to be re-arrested for a felony than the expelled population. These results show that participants that are successful are less likely to recidivate than those who were not successful in drug court. These results show that the La Crosse County Drug Court is effective in reducing the likelihood of re-arrest for felony crimes in the graduate population. Furthermore, the correlation analysis found that the expelled population was less likely to be re-arrested for a misdemeanor crime than the control group. This shows that people with some exposure to drug court, whether negative or positive, fare better than those without any exposure to drug court. Control theory would argue that because the drug court was able to effectively regain social control over the graduate population and to a lesser extent the expelled population, they were less likely to recidivate.

The logistic regression analysis found that controls were less likely to be re-arrested for a felony crime than the graduate population, when holding age, race, and gender constant. This result is not consistent with the previous research which states that graduates are less likely to recidivate after controlling for demographics (Kalich and Evans 2006). However, when any other variable is added or taken out of the logistic regression the significance between the

status in the program and felony recidivism disappears. Therefore, I would infer that this result is the outcome of the fact that because the control group is more likely to be in prison and therefore was not able to recidivate unlike the graduate population. Furthermore, graduates were found to be three times less likely to be re-arrested for a misdemeanor crime than the expelled population when controlling for age, race and gender. However, the significance also disappears as variables are added or subtracted from the logistic regression. This result can also be attributed to the fact that the expelled population is more likely to be in prison following their expulsion from the program, however data was not collected for the amount of people who were in prison during this study. Therefore, this explanation can only be hypothesized and no clear answer can be given.

The descriptive analysis found that graduates were disproportionally male, white and older than the entire population. Furthermore, graduates had the lowest average total LSI score of 19.88, while the control group and expelled population had a score of 24.2 and a 26.0, respectively. As long as the LSI is perceived to be reliable, the control group and expelled population are more high risk than the graduates upon entering the program. The fact that graduates are most likely older and white is consistent with the previous research, however males were found to be more likely to recidivate than females which is the opposite of this study's findings (Kalich and Evans 2006; Spohn et al. 2001).

CONCLUSION

This research took all the participants of the La Crosse County Drug Court and compared them with a control group comprised of people that had been referred to drug court, but were

not accepted. The data was separated into three categories, controls, graduates and the expelled populations. These groups were compared to each other along with several other independent variables in regards to recidivism rates, both felony and misdemeanor. A correlation analysis was used to determine whether each of the independent variables had a significant relationship with recidivism rates. Some significant results were found in this analysis, such as graduates being less likely to be re-arrested for a felony crime than the control group.

Furthermore, logistic regression analysis was conducted to determine if any of the independent variables had significance with recidivism if all of the other independents were held constant. This analysis showed significance to some of the variables. Age and race were found to be significant predictors for misdemeanor re-arrest rates and a few of the LSI sub-scores showed some significance. Also, the logistic regression analysis found that controls were less likely to recidivate than graduates of the La Crosse County Drug Court when holding demographics constant.

Although research is being done on the effectiveness of drug courts across the nation, research should be done consistently to find the long term effects of drug court. Furthermore, research should be conducted by following the graduates after an exact amount a time. The La Crosse County Drug Court is relatively new, starting in 2000. Thus, each participant was at a different stage in their time away from drug court at the time the data for this study was collected. Some participants graduated three years ago while others were as close as two months ago. This creates an unfair advantage to those that have not been out of drug court

that long. Therefore, more research should be done on a consistent basis regarding length of time out of the program.

This research shows that there is a clear impact of the La Crosse County Drug Court, and this program does work for a majority of the graduates. Although the findings of this study were inconclusive, the effectiveness of the La Crosse County Drug Court can be measured in many different ways other than just recidivism rates. Research can be done regarding the quality of life at the beginning and end of drug court for each participant. Also, drug use after graduation could be an important indicator of the effectiveness of the program as well as many other things. Drug courts across the nation are developing new policies and procedures according to the results published by program evaluations of individual programs.

Drug courts have become an instrumental part of the criminal justice system over the last two decades in reducing the amount of recidivism of drug-related offenders. As drug courts become older and more experienced in their policies, research on the effects of drug courts becomes crucial to whether or not they are gaining results. At a time when prison populations are becoming an epidemic to the system, a more therapeutic approach needs to be taken (Wolfe, Guydish and Termondt 2002). Drug courts have demonstrated they make a difference not only in recidivism rates for its participants, but also in the quality of their lives.

REFERENCES

Andrews, D.A. and James L. Bonta. 1995. *LSI-R: The Level of Service Inventory- Revised.* North Tonawanda: Multi-Health Systems, Inc.

Girard, Lina and J. Stephen Wormith. 2004. "The Predictive Validity of the Level of Service Inventory-Ontario Revision on General and Violent Recidivism among Various Offender Groups." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 31(2):150-181. Retrieved February 22, 2008 (Criminal Justice Abstracts).

Gilmore, Amna Saddik, Nancy Rodriguez, and Vincent J. Webb. 2005. "Substance Abuse and Drug Courts: The Role of Social Bonds in Juvenile Drug Courts." *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* 3:287-315. Retrieved March 6, 2008 (Criminal Justice Abstracts).

Gottfredson, Michael R., and Travis Hirschi. 1995. "National Crime Control Policies." *Society* January/February:30-36. Retrieved March 7, 2008 (Sociological Abstracts).

Kalich, DeAnn M., and Rhonda D. Evans. 2006. "Drug Court: An effective alternative incarceration." *Deviant Behavior* 27:569-590. Retrieved January 31, 2008 (Sociological Abstracts).

Listwan, Shelley Johnson, Jody L. Sundt, Alexander M. Holsinger and Edward J. Latessa. 2003. "The Effect of Drug Court Programming on Recidivism: the Cincinnati Experience." *Crime & Delinquency* 49:389-411. Retrieved January 31, 2008 (Sociological Abstracts).

Mills, Jeremy F., Daryl G. Kroner and Toni Hemmati. 2003. "Predicting Violent Behavior through A Static-Stable Variable Lens." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 18(8):891-904. Retrieved February 22, 2008 (Criminal Justice Abstracts).

Peters, Roger H., Amie L. Haas and W. Micheal Hunt. 2001. "Treatment "Dosage" Effects in Drug Court Programs." *Drug Courts in Operation: Current Research* Pp. 63-72. Retrieved February 22, 2008 (Criminal Justice Abstracts).

Peters, Roger H., and Mary R. Murrin. 2000. "Effectiveness of Treatment-Based Drug Courts in Reducing Criminal Recidivism." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 27(1):72-96. Retrieved February 14, 2008 (Criminal Justice Abstracts).

Spohn, Cassia, R.K. Piper, Tom Martin, and Erika Davis Frenzel. 2001. "Drug Courts and Recidivism: The Results of an Evaluation Using Two Comparison Groups and Multiple Indicators of Recidivism." *Journal of Drug Issues* 31(1):149-176. Retrieved January 31, 2008 (Sociological Abstracts).

Wolfe, Ellen, Joseph Guydish and Jenna Termondt. 2002. "A Drug Court Outcome Evaluation Comparing Arrests in a Two Year Follow-up Period." *Journal of Drug Issues* 4:1155-1172. Retrieved February 11, 2008 (Sociological Abstracts).

TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

Variables	Total Sample N	Valid %/Mean	Variables	Total Sample N	Valid %/Mean
Dependent					
Felony Recidivism		%	Race		%
No	114	72.6	White	127	80.9
Yes	43	27.4	Non- White	30	19.1
Misdemeanor Recidivism		%			
No	98	62.4	Total LSI Score (Mean)	125	23.55
Yes	59	37.6	LSI Sub-scores (Mean)		
Independent			Criminal History	108	3.91
Status in Drug Court		%	Education/Employment	107	5.03
Control	69	43.9	Financial	107	1.01
Graduate	28	17.8	Family/Marital	107	1.35
Current	29	18.5	Accommodation	107	0.71
Expelled	31	19.7	Recreation	107	0.98
			Companions	107	2.04
Length of Time In Program (Mean)	157	12.17 Months	Substance Abuse	107	6.21
			Emotional/Personal	107	1.85
Age (Mean)	157	34.24	Attitudes/Orientation	107	0.46
Gender		%			
Male	96	61.1			
Female	61	38.9			

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Control, Graduate, and Expelled Groups

Variables	Control		Graduates		Expelled	
Dependent	**N**	**Valid %/Mean**	**N**	**Valid %/Mean**	**N**	**Valid %/Mean**
Felony Recidivism		%		%		%
No	44	63.8	25	89.3	20	64.5
Yes	25	36.2	3	10.7	11	35.5
Misdemeanor Recidivism		%		%		%
No	35	50.7	19	67.9	23	74.2
Yes	34	49.3	9	32.1	8	25.8
Independent						
Length of Time In Program (Mean)	69	0 Months	28	19 Months	31	19.42 Months
Age (Mean)	69	32.94	28	38.96	31	32.52
Gender		%		%		%
Male	43	62.3	21	75	18	58.1
Female	26	37.7	7	25	13	41.9
Race		%		%		%
White	55	79.7	25	89.3	23	74.2
Non- White	14	20.3	3	10.7	8	25.8
Total LSI Score (Mean)	44	24.2	25	19.88	27	25.81
LSI Subscores (Mean)						
Criminal History	38	3.63	23	3.3	19	4.74
Education/Employment	38	4.76	22	4.27	19	6.58
Financial	38	1.11	22	0.82	19	1.16
Family/Marital	38	1.61	22	0.91	19	1.42
Accommodation	38	0.79	22	0.55	19	0.95
Recreation	38	1.16	22	0.73	19	1
Companions	38	2.13	22	1.73	19	2.16
Substance Abuse	38	5.97	22	5.91	19	6.53
Emotional/Personal	38	2.37	22	1.23	19	1.42
Attitudes/Orientation	38	0.89	22	0.18	19	0.37

Table 3. Correlations for the Effectiveness of the La Crosse County Drug Court

	Felony Recidivism	Misdemeanor Recidivism
Length of time in Program	-0.093	-0.15
Age	-0.012	-.187*
Gender	-0.05	-0.079
LSI Total	0.093	0.092
LSI-Criminal History	0.183	0.129
LSI-Education/Employment	0.157	-0.007
LSI- Financial	-0.007	-.252**
LSI- Family/Marital	-0.037	0.046
LSI- Accommodation	0.15	0.152
LSI- Leisure/Recreation	0.069	0.144
LSI- Companions	0.092	0.095
LSI- Substance Abuse	0.011	-0.119
LSI- Emotional/Personal	-0.156	-0.045
LSI- Attitudes/Orienation	0.113	0.168
Race	0.065	0.091
Controls vs. Graduates	-.255*	-0.156
Control vs. Expelled	-0.007	-.220*
Graduates vs. Expelled	.291*	-0.07

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4. Logistic Regression for Felony Recidivism with LSI Sub-scores

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Length of Time in Program	0.058	0.041	2.035	1	0.154	1.06
Age	0.009	0.038	0.052	1	0.82	1.009
Gender	-0.795	0.9	0.78	1	0.377	0.452
Race	-0.95	0.99	0.92	1	0.337	0.387
Status in Program (Graduates and Controls)	2.099	1.343	2.443	1	0.118	8.161
Status in Program (Graduates and Expelled)	0.906	1.113	0.663	1	0.415	2.475
LSI- Criminal History	0.159	0.171	0.855	1	0.355	1.172
LSI-Education/Employment	0.231	0.159	2.122	1	0.145	1.26
LSI-Financial	-0.844	0.689	1.501	1	0.22	0.43
LSI-Family/Marital	-0.695	0.418	2.761	1	0.097	0.499
LSI-Accommodation	1.711	0.613	7.79	1	0.005	5.533
LSI-Leisure/Recreation	0.617	0.489	1.593	1	0.207	1.853
LSI-Companions	0.689	0.334	4.26	1	0.039	1.991
LSI-Substance Abuse	-0.226	0.218	1.76	1	0.3	0.797
LSI-Emotional/Personal	-0.477	0.328	2.112	1	0.146	0.621
LSI-Attitudes/Orientation	0.223	0.305	0.535	1	0.464	1.25
Constant	-4.436	2.178	1.149	1	0.042	0.012

Table 5. Logistic Regression for Felony Recidivism with LSI Total Score

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Length of Time in Program	0.029	0.03	0.945	1	0.331	1.03
Age	-0.002	0.025	0.007	1	0.931	0.998
Gender	-0.718	0.584	1.514	1	0.219	0.488
Race	0.334	0.614	0.296	1	0.586	1.396
Status in Program (Graduates and Controls)	1.571	0.98	2.57	1	0.109	4.811
Status in Program (Graduates and Expelled)	1.393	0.797	3.057	1	0.08	4.026
LSI-Total Score	0.033	0.038	0.739	1	0.39	1.033
Constant	-3.098	1.465	4.445	1	0.035	0.046

Table 6. Logistic Regression for Felony Recidivism with only demographics

	B	S.E	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Status in Program (Graduates and Controls)	-1.607	0.744	4.657	1	0.031	0.201
Status in Program (Graduates and Expelled)	0.037	0.457	0.006	1	0.936	1.037
Age	0.012	0.021	0.363	1	0.547	1.013
Gender	-0.299	0.419	0.511	1	0.475	0.741
Race	0.354	0.482	0.538	1	0.463	1.424

Table 7. Logistic Regression for Misdemeanor Recidivism with LSI Sub-scores

	B	S.E.	Wald	**df**	**Sig.**	**Exp(B)**
Length of Time in Program	-0.038	0.043	0.763	1	0.882	0.963
Age	-0.052	0.037	1.941	1	0.164	0.949
Gender	0.227	0.86	0.07	1	0.792	1.255
Race	1.462	0.858	2.907	1	0.088	4.316
Status in Program (Graduates and Controls)	-1.086	1.275	0.725	1	0.395	0.338
Status in Program (Graduates and Expelled)	-1.102	1.082	1.039	1	0.308	0.332
LSI- Criminal History	0.267	0.17	2.474	1	0.116	1.306
LSI-Education/Employment	0.129	0.141	0.846	1	0.358	1.138
LSI-Financial	-1.723	0.711	5.873	1	0.015	0.178
LSI-Family/Marital	-0.095	0.353	0.072	1	0.788	0.91
LSI-Accommodation	0.773	0.524	2.176	1	0.14	2.167
LSI-Leisure/Recreation	0.7	0.451	2.403	1	0.121	2.013
LSI-Companions	0.278	0.286	0.939	1	0.333	1.32
LSI-Substance Abuse	-0.212	0.2	1.124	1	0.289	0.809
LSI-Emotional/Personal	0.07	0.314	0.05	1	0.823	1.073
LSI-Attitudes/Orientation	0.489	0.321	2.325	1	0.127	1.631
Constant	0.776	1.882	0.17	1	0.68	2.174

Table 8. Logistic Regression for Misdemeanor Recidivism with LSI Total Score

	B	S.E.	Wald	**df**	**Sig.**	**Exp(B)**
Length of Time in Program	-0.033	0.041	0.637	1	0.425	0.968
Age	-0.087	0.03	8.501	1	0.004	0.917
Gender	-0.715	0.573	1.556	1	0.212	0.489
Race	1.329	0.647	4.216	1	0.04	3.778
Status in Program (Graduates and Controls)	-0.771	1.074	0.515	1	0.473	0.462
Status in Program (Graduates and Expelled)	-1.219	0.815	2.236	1	0.135	0.296
LSI-Total Score	0.069	0.039	3.085	1	0.079	1.071
Constant	1.401	1.531	0.838	1	0.36	4.061

Table 9. Logistic Regression for Misdemeanor Recidivism with only Demographics

	B	S.E.	Wald	**df**	**Sig.**	**Exp(B)**
Status in Program (Graduates and Controls)	0.693	0.617	1.264	1	0.261	2
Status in Program (Graduates and Expelled)	1.127	0.49	5.29	1	0.021	3.087
Age	-0.047	0.02	5.255	1	0.022	0.954
Gender	-0.148	0.406	0.132	1	0.716	0.863
Race	0.82	0.488	2.825	1	0.093	2.271