

Appendix A

**Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring Program
(ADAM) Data:
2000 Annualized
Denver Site Report**

Appendix B

Summary of Literature Review Findings

Drug Court Location	Author	Comparison Group	Follow-up Period	Findings
Maricopa County	Turner, Susan	Random assignment	12 months 36 months	All groups equally likely to be rearrested. Drug court participants significantly less likely to be rearrested.
Washington D.C.	Harrell, A.	Random assignment to standard, treatment or sanctions dockets	1 year post-sentence	Sanctions group significantly less likely to be arrested (19%). No difference in arrest rates for standard and treatment groups (27%).
Santa Clara County	Santa Clara County Drug Treatment Court	Other non-participating but eligible offenders, and those receiving deferred judgments	2 years	Drug court participants had lowest re-arrest rates (8%) compared to those who did not participate (47%) and those with deferred judgments (27%). Only 1% of drug court group had multiple arrests, vs. 20% of non-participants and 9% of deferred judgments.
Delaware	Wilhite, S.A. and O'Connell, J.P	Compared drug court completers to non-completers		Re-arrest rates were lower for those who did complete the program. Those who completed also had fewer felony arrests.
Delaware	Delaware SAC	Drug court clients vs. other clients	18 months post-sentencing	Drug court clients more likely to complete treatment than were other clients.
Florida	Peters, R.H.	Matched comparison group of probationers	12 months following program entry.	Graduates significantly less likely to be arrested during the 12-month program period.
Florida	Peters, R.H.	Non-graduates and a matched comparison group	30 months following program entry.	Graduates significantly less likely to be arrested during the 30-month follow-up period. Graduates had fewer felony arrests, fewer property crimes and violent crimes, and had fewer probation or parole violations.
Jefferson County, KY	Vito, G.F.	Non-graduates and a self-drop comparison group		Graduates had lower recidivism rates (13%) compared to non-graduates (59.5%) and comparison group (55.4%).
Madison County, IL	Godley, M.D.	Those who declined drug court	12 months following program entry.	Participants had significant reduction in arrests compared to those who declined.
Monterey County	Roehl, J.	Comparison group and non-completers	5-6 months	6% of drug court graduates rec'd new drug -related felony conviction, vs. 27% of comparison group and 50% of non-completers.
Las Vegas Drug Court	Miethe, T.D.	Clark County District Court		Drug court offenders recidivated at a higher rate, 26% vs. those processed in another court at 16%.

Multnomah County, OR	Finigan, M.	Eligible defendants who did not enter program	24 months	Drug court participants averaged .59 arrests, comparison groups averaged 1.53 arrests.
Multnomah County, OR	Finigan, M.	Participants completing less than one third of program		Those who participated minimally had twice as many arrests compared to those who completed at least a third of the program.
Oakland CA	Tauber	Historical comparison group	36 months	Average arrests declined from 1.33 per defendant to .75 after establishment of drug court.
Riverside County, CA	Sechrest, et al.	Historical comparison group	Up to 21 months for drug court participants and 27 months for comparison	13.4% of drug court participants rearrested, 33.0% of comparison group.
Denver, CO	Granfield & Eby	Historical comparison group	12 months	53.0% of drug court participants rearrested, 58.0% of comparison group.
Dade County, FL	Goldkamp & Weiland	Self-selected eligible defendants, ineligible defendants and a historical comparison group	18 months	33.2% of drug court participants rearrested, compared to 48.7% of comparison group (averaged over the 3 comparison samples).
Baltimore MD	Gottfredson, et al.	Matched comparison drawn from District and Circuit Courts and historical.	6 months	District drug court participants rearrested 22.6% of cases, comparison 27.1%. Circuit drug court participants rearrested 26.5% of cases, comparison 30.4%. Historical comparison group rearrested 30.2 percent of cases, while matched sample of drug court clients rearrested 18.5% of cases.
Travis County, TX	Kelly	Matched Historical comparison group	12 months	38.0% of drug court participants rearrested, 41.0% of comparison group.
Philadelphia, PA	Crime & Justice Research Institute	Self selected eligible and ineligible offenders	6 months	20.0% of drug court participants rearrested, compared to 24.0% of those who declined program and 38.0% of ineligible comparison group. Median time to first arrest was much longer for drug court group than for comparison groups.

Oklahoma	Oklahoma Criminal Justice Resource Center	Matched comparison group of probationers	24 months	14% of drug court participants rearrested, 22% of comparison group.
Polk County, IA	Iowa Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning	Offenders screened but rejected from drug court and historical comparison group	Up to 762 days, Averaging 655 days	New convictions occurred for: 33.3% of drug court successes 61.5% of drug court failures 54.6% of ineligible group 74.8% of pre-drug court group

Bibliography of above studies:

Turner, Susan. Unpublished draft of a three-year follow-up of the Maricopa First Time Drug Offenders Program. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Harrell, A., Cavanagh, S., and Roman, John. (April 2000). Evaluation of the D.C. Superior Court Drug Intervention Programs. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

Santa Clara County Drug Treatment Court, two-year progress report and outcome comparisons, March 1, 1996-March 31, 1998. (June 1998). Obtained from www.american.edu/justice.

Wilhite, S.A. and O'Connell, J.P. (1998). The Delaware Drug Court: A baseline evaluation. Dover, DE: State of Delaware Statistical Analysis Center and Anova Associates.

Delaware Statistical Analysis Center, (1999). Addiction Sentences, draft report, Wilmington, DE: Delaware Statistical Analysis Center.

Peters, R.H., Murrin, M.R. (1998). Evaluation of treatment-based drug courts in Florida's first judicial circuit. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, Department of Mental Health Law & Policy, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, University of South Florida.

Vito, G.F., Tewksbury, R.A. (1998). Jefferson county Drug Court Program: Impact Evaluation, 1997. (Obtained from the National Drug Court Institute).

Godley, M.D., Dennis, M. L., Funk, R., Siekmann, M. and Weisheit, R. (1998). Madison County assessment and treatment alternative court: Final evaluation report. Bloomington, IL: Lighthouse Institute Chestnut Health Systems.

Roehl, J. (July 1998). Monterey county drug court - evaluation report #1. Pacific Grove, CA: Justice Research Center.

Miethe, T.D., Lu, H. and Reese, E. (2000). Reintegrative Shaming and Recidivism Risks in Drug Court: Explanations for some Unexpected Findings. Crime and Delinquency 46(4).

Finigan, M. 1998. An outcome evaluation of the Multnomah County S.T.O.P. Drug Diversion Program. Alexandria, VA: State Justice Institute.

Best Practice Number Nine: Processing Non-Violent Drug Offenders through Treatment-Oriented Drug Courts. Memphis Shelby Crime Commission. Retrieved 5/30/01 from <http://www.memphiscrime.org/research/bestpractices/bestpractices-9.html#data>

Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency. Retrieved 4/24/01 from <http://www.pccd.state.pa.us/pccdtop.html>

Wright, D. and Clymer, B. (2000). Evaluation of Oklahoma Drug Courts, 1997-2000; Oklahoma City, OK: Oklahoma Criminal Justice Resource Center.

Stageberg, P., Wilson, B. Moore, R.G. (January 2001). Final Report on the Polk County Adult Drug Court. Iowa Department of Human Rights, Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning. Available at: <http://www.state.ia.us/dhr/cjpp/pdfs/drugcourt.pdf>

Appendix C

Data Collection Forms

Appendix D

**Comparison Of
1995 Drug Court Cases
To
1996 Drug Court Cases**

COMPARISON OF 1995 DRUG COURT CASES TO 1996 DRUG COURT CASES

	CASE YEAR	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Significance Level
CRIMINAL HISTORY SCORE	95	285	1.4551	2.3804	N. S.
	96	234	1.4965	2.2109	
AGE AT 1ST ARREST	95	270	22.63	7.10	N.S.
	96	225	22.69	8.10	
LAST GRADE COMPLETED	95	266	11.60	2.79	N.S.
	96	229	11.59	2.45	
OFFENDER MH NEEDS	95	260	.38	.82	N.S.
	96	205	.49	.99	
OFFENDER ALCOHOL NEEDS	95	265	1.88	1.00	N.S.
	96	213	1.94	1.05	
OFFENDER DRUG NEEDS	95	269	2.72	.69	N.S.
	96	214	2.73	.69	
BEHAVIOR SEVERITY SCORE	95	285	1.01	.19	N.S.
	96	234	1.00	.00	
LSI SCORE	95	228	23.58	9.08	N.S.
	96	148	23.60	8.93	
DAST SCORE	95	180	5.77	4.44	N.S.
	96	5	5.80	2.68	
ADS SCORE	95	180	2.18	5.07	N.S.
	96	5	1.40	1.34	
DISRUPT SUBSCALE SCORE	95	221	13.74	15.80	N.S.
	96	138	11.64	14.91	
DEFENSE SUBSCALE SCORE	95	220	8.70	4.22	N.S.
	96	137	8.44	3.84	
AGE AT ARREST	95	285	31.32	8.51	N.S.
	96	234	31.19	9.93	

			CASE YEAR		Total
			95	96	
SEX	MALE	Count	223	177	400
		% within YEAR	78.2%	75.6%	77.1%
	FEMALE	Count	62	57	119
		% within YEAR	21.8%	24.4%	22.9%
Total	Count		285	234	519
	% within YEAR		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*No significant difference between groups

			CASE YEAR		Total
			95	96	
ETHNICITY	ANGLO	Count	84	63	147
		% within YEAR	29.8%	27.3%	28.7%
	BLACK	Count	107	91	198
		% within YEAR	37.9%	39.4%	38.6%
	HISPANIC	Count	91	75	166
		% within YEAR	32.3%	32.5%	32.4%
	OTHER	Count		1	1
		% within YEAR		.4%	.2%
Total		Count	282	231	513
		% within YEAR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*No significant difference between groups

			YEAR		Total
			95	96	
MARITAL STATUS	SINGLE	Count	140	110	250
		% within YEAR	51.3%	48.9%	50.2%
	MARRIED	Count	40	44	84
		% within YEAR	14.7%	19.6%	16.9%
	SEP/ DIVORCED	Count	66	54	120
		% within YEAR	24.2%	24.0%	24.1%
	WIDOWED	Count	4		4
		% within YEAR	1.5%		.8%
	COMMON LAW	Count	22	17	39
		% within YEAR	8.1%	7.6%	7.8%
Total		Count	273	225	498
		% within YEAR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*No significant difference between groups

			YEAR		Total
			95	96	
EMPLOYMENT AT ARREST	FULL TIME	Count	72	86	158
		% within YEAR	25.9%	37.2%	31.0%
	PART TIME	Count	28	16	44
		% within YEAR	10.1%	6.9%	8.6%
	UNEMPLOYED	Count	157	112	269
		% within YEAR	56.5%	48.5%	52.8%
	SPORADIC	Count	21	17	38
		% within YEAR	7.6%	7.4%	7.5%
Total		Count	278	231	509
		% within YEAR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Significant at P < .05

			CASE YEAR		Total
			95	96	
RESIDENT STABILITY	CONTINUOUSLY RESIDED AT SAME ADDRESS	Count	77	76	153
		% within YEAR	35.5%	40.0%	37.6%
	MOVED 1,2,3, TIMES	Count	87	79	166
		% within YEAR	40.1%	41.6%	40.8%
	MOVED 4 OR MORE TIMES	Count	53	35	88
		% within YEAR	24.5%	18.5%	21.6%
Total	Count	217	190	407	
	% within YEAR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

*No significant difference between groups

			CASE YEAR		Total
			95	96	
OFFENDER MH NEEDS	NONE/NOT SERIOUS	Count	204	160	364
		% within YEAR	78.5%	78.0%	78.3%
	NO INTERFERENCE W/FUNCTIONING	Count	25	10	35
		% within YEAR	9.6%	4.9%	7.5%
	SOME DISRUPTION OF FUNCTIONING	Count	18	15	33
		% within YEAR	6.9%	7.3%	7.1%
	SERIOUS DISRUPTION OF FUNCTIONING	Count	13	20	33
		% within YEAR	5.0%	9.8%	7.1%
Total	Count	260	205	465	
	% within YEAR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

*No significant difference between groups

			CASE YEAR		Total
			95	96	
OFFENDER ALCOHOL NEEDS	NONE/NOT SERIOUS	Count	24	21	45
		% within YEAR	9.1%	9.9%	9.4%
	NO INTERFERENCE W/FUNCTIONING	Count	77	61	138
		% within YEAR	29.1%	28.6%	28.9%
	SOME DISRUPTION OF FUNCTIONING	Count	70	40	110
		% within YEAR	26.4%	18.8%	23.0%
	SERIOUS DISRUPTION OF FUNCTIONING	Count	94	91	185
		% within YEAR	35.5%	42.7%	38.7%
Total	Count	265	213	478	
	% within YEAR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

*No significant difference between groups

			CASE YEAR		Total
			95	96	
OFFENDER DRUG NEEDS	NONE/NOT SERIOUS	Count	9	5	14
		% within YEAR	3.3%	2.3%	2.9%
	NO INTERFERENCE W/FUNCTIONING	Count	9	15	24
		% within YEAR	3.3%	7.0%	5.0%
SOME DISRUPTION OF FUNCTIONING	Count	31	13	44	
	% within YEAR	11.5%	6.1%	9.1%	
SERIOUS DISRUPTION OF FUNCTIONING	Count	220	181	401	
	% within YEAR	81.8%	84.6%	83.0%	
Total		Count	269	214	483
		% within YEAR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*No significant difference between groups

			CASE YEAR		Total
			95	96	
RECORD OF ABUSE AS A CHILD	NO	Count	162	110	272
		% within YEAR	93.6%	94.8%	94.1%
	YES	Count	11	6	17
		% within YEAR	6.4%	5.2%	5.9%
Total		Count	173	116	289
		% within YEAR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*No significant difference between groups

			CASE YEAR		Total
			95	96	
FORMER GANG INVOLVEMENT	NO	Count	244	209	453
		% within YEAR	96.4%	96.8%	96.6%
	YES	Count	9	7	16
		% within YEAR	3.6%	3.2%	3.4%
Total		Count	253	216	469
		% within YEAR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*No significant difference between groups

			YEAR		Total
			95	96	
CURRENT GANG INVOLVEMENT	NO	Count	244	211	455
		% within YEAR	96.8%	97.7%	97.2%
	YES	Count	8	5	13
		% within YEAR	3.2%	2.3%	2.8%
Total		Count	252	216	468
		% within YEAR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*No significant difference between groups

			CASE YEAR		Total
			95	96	
ELECTRONIC MONITORING	NO	Count	263	202	465
		% within YEAR	92.3%	86.3%	89.6%
	YES	Count	22	32	54
		% within YEAR	7.7%	13.7%	10.4%
Total		Count	285	234	519
		% within YEAR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Significant at P < .05

			CASE YEAR		Total
			95	96	
UPS	NO	Count	77	49	126
		% within YEAR	27.0%	20.9%	24.3%
	YES	Count	208	185.00	393
		% within YEAR	73.0%	79.10	75.7%
Total		Count	285	234	519
		% within YEAR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*No significant difference between groups

			CASE YEAR		Total
			95	96	
Instrument Derived Treatment Level	1 No Treatment	Count	8	4	12
		% within YEAR	4.5%	2.8%	3.7%
	2 UA's, Drug and Alcohol Education	Count	35	29	64
		% within YEAR	19.6%	20.0%	19.8%
	3 Weekly Outpatient	Count	50	37	87
		% within YEAR	27.9%	25.5%	26.9%
	4 Intensive Outpatient	Count	50	50	100
		% within YEAR	27.9%	34.5%	30.9%
	5 Intensive Residential	Count	28	15	43
		% within YEAR	15.6%	10.3%	13.3%
	6 Therapeutic Community	Count	6	9	15
		% within YEAR	3.4%	6.2%	4.6%
	7 Assess for Psychopathy	Count	2	1	3
		% within YEAR	1.1%	.7%	.9%
Total		Count	179	145	324
		% within YEAR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*No significant difference between groups

			CASE YEAR		Total
			95	96	
Drug Type Charged	Cocaine*	Count	185	177	362
		% within YEAR	64.9%	75.6%	69.7%
	MJ	Count	13	17	30
		% within YEAR	4.6%	7.3%	5.8%
	Heroin**	Count	48	16	64
		% within YEAR	16.8%	6.8%	12.3%
	Stimulants	Count	18	11	29
		% within YEAR	6.3%	4.7%	5.6%
	Other	Count	21	13	34
		% within YEAR	7.4%	5.6%	6.6%
Total		Count	285	234	519
		% within YEAR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Significantly different on cocaine at $P < .01$

**Significantly different on heroin at $P < .001$

			YEAR		Total
			95	96	
Recoded LSI Scores	0-18 (LOW)	Count	66	42	108
		% within YEAR	28.9%	28.4%	28.7%
	19-28 (MED)	Count	86	59	145
		% within YEAR	37.7%	39.9%	38.6%
	29-54 (HIGH)	Count	76	47	123
		% within YEAR	33.3%	31.8%	32.7%
Total		Count	228	148	376
		% within YEAR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*No significant difference between groups

			YEAR		Total
			95	96	
Recoded age at time of this arrest	18-25 Years Old	Count	78	69	147
		% within YEAR	28.3%	30.8%	29.4%
	26-35 Years Old	Count	107	67	174
		% within YEAR	38.8%	29.9%	34.8%
	>35 Years Old	Count	91	88	179
		% within YEAR	33.0%	39.3%	35.8%
Total		Count	276	224	500
		% within YEAR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*No significant difference between groups

			YEAR		Total
			95	96	
Recoded Education	< High School	Count	115	102	217
		% within YEAR	43.2%	44.7%	43.9%
	GED	Count	32	22	54
		% within YEAR	12.0%	9.6%	10.9%
	High School Graduate	Count	49	55	104
		% within YEAR	18.4%	24.1%	21.1%
	> High School	Count	70	49	119
		% within YEAR	26.3%	21.5%	24.1%
Total	Count	266	228	494	
	% within YEAR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

*No significant difference between groups

			YEAR		Total
			95	96	
PRIOR ADULT CONVICTION OR JUVENILE ADJUDICATION	NO	Count	153	135	288
		% within YEAR	53.7%	57.7%	55.5%
	YES	Count	132	99	231
		% within YEAR	46.3%	42.3%	44.5%
Total	Count	285	234	519	
	% within YEAR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

*No significant difference between groups

			YEAR		Total
			95	96	
PRIOR DRUG OFFENSE	NO	Count	200	163	363
		% within YEAR	70.2%	69.7%	69.9%
	YES	Count	85	71	156
		% within YEAR	29.8%	30.3%	30.1%
Total	Count	285	234	519	
	% within YEAR	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

*No significant difference between groups

Appendix E

**Comparison Of
1993
Historical Comparison Group
To
1995/1996
Drug Court Group**

**COMPARISON OF 1993
HISTORICAL COMPARISON CASES
TO 1995/96 DRUG COURT CASES**

	Experimental Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Significance Level
CRIMINAL HISTORY SCORE	1993	105	.89	1.17	.002
	1995 & 1996	519	1.29	1.48	
AGE AT 1ST ARREST	1993	89	25.45	7.23	.001
	1995 & 1996	495	22.66	7.56	
LAST GRADE COMPLETED	1993	98	11.68	2.62	N.S.
	1995 & 1996	495	11.59	2.63	
OFFENDER MH NEEDS	1993	94	.41	.96	N.S.
	1995 & 1996	465	.43	.90	
OFFENDER ALC NEEDS	1993	94	1.52	1.39	.011
	1995 & 1996	478	1.91	1.02	
OFFENDER DRUG NEEDS	1993	102	2.61	.95	N.S.
	1995 & 1996	483	2.72	.69	
BEHAVIOR SEVERITY SCORE	1993	105	1.03	.32	N.S.
	1995 & 1996	519	1.00	.14	
AGE AT CURRENT ARREST	1993	105	32.06	8.35	N.S.
	1995 & 1996	519	31.26	9.17	

			Experimental Group		Total
			1993	1995 & 1996	
SEX	MALE	Count	85	400	485
		% within Experimental Group	81.0%	77.1%	77.7%
	FEMALE	Count	20	119	139
		% within Experimental Group	19.0%	22.9%	22.3%
Total		Count	105	519	624
		% within Experimental Group	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*No significant difference between groups.

			Experimental Group		Total
			1993	1995 & 1996	
ETHNICITY	ANGLO	Count	26	147	173
		% within Experimental Group	27.7%	28.7%	28.5%
	BLACK	Count	35	198	233
		% within Experimental Group	37.2%	38.6%	38.4%
	HISPANIC	Count	33	166	199
		% within Experimental Group	35.1%	32.4%	32.8%
	OTHER	Count		2	2
		% within Experimental Group		.4%	.4%
Total		Count	94	513	607
		% within Experimental Group	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*No significant difference between groups.

			Experimental Group		Total
			1993	1995 & 1996	
MARITAL STATUS	SINGLE	Count	52	250	302
		% within Experimental Group	52.0%	50.2%	50.5%
	MARRIED	Count	26	84	110
		% within Experimental Group	26.0%	16.9%	18.4%
	SEP/DIV	Count	22	120	142
		% within Experimental Group	22.0%	24.1%	23.7%
	WIDOWED	Count		4	4
		% within Experimental Group		.8%	.7%
	COMMON LAW	Count		39	39
		% within Experimental Group		7.8%	6.5%
Total		Count	100	497	597
		% within Experimental Group	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Significant at P<.001

			Experimental Group		Total
			1993	1995 & 1996	
EMPLOYMENT AT ARREST	FULL TIME	Count	38	158	196
		% within Experimental Group	39.6%	31.0%	32.4%
	PART TIME	Count	4	44	48
		% within Experimental Group	4.2%	8.6%	7.9%
	UNEMPLOYED	Count	50	269	319
		% within Experimental Group	52.1%	52.8%	52.7%
	SPORADIC	Count	4	38	42
		% within Experimental Group	4.2%	7.5%	6.9%
Total		Count	96	509	605
		% within Experimental Group	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*No significant difference between groups.

			Experimental Group		Total
			1 1993 data	2 1995 & 1996 data	
RESIDENTIAL STABILITY	CONTINUOUSLY RESIDED AT SAME ADDRESS	Count	39	153	192
		% within Experimental Group	41.1%	37.6%	38.2%
	MOVED 1,2,3, TIMES	Count	47	166	213
		% within Experimental Group	49.5%	40.8%	42.4%
	MOVED 4 OR MORE TIMES	Count	9	88	97
		% within Experimental Group	9.5%	21.6%	19.4%
Total		Count	95	407	502
		% within Experimental Group	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

**Significant at P<.001

			Experimental Group		Total
			1993	1995 & 1996	
OFFENDER MH NEEDS	NONE/NOT SERIOUS	Count % within Experimental Group	78 83.0%	364 78.3%	442 79.1%
	NO INTERFERENCE W/FUNCTIONING	Count % within Experimental Group	1 1.1%	35 7.5%	36 6.4%
	SOME DISRUPTION OF FUNCTIONING	Count % within Experimental Group	7 7.4%	33 7.1%	40 7.2%
	SERIOUS DISRUPTION OF FUNCTIONING	Count % within Experimental Group	8 8.5%	33 7.1%	41 7.3%
Total	Count % within Experimental Group	94 100.0%	465 100.0%	559 100.0%	

*No significant difference between groups.

			Experimental Group		Total
			1993	1995 & 1996	
OFFENDER ALC NEEDS	NONE/NOT SERIOUS	Count % within Experimental Group	43 45.7%	183 38.3%	226 39.5%
	SOME DISRUPTION OF FUNCTIONING	Count % within Experimental Group	13 13.8%	110 23.0%	123 21.5%
	SERIOUS DISRUPTION OF FUNCTIONING	Count % within Experimental Group	38 40.4%	185 38.7%	223 39.0%
Total	Count % within Experimental Group	94 100.0%	478 100.0%	572 100.0%	

*No significant difference between groups.

			Experimental Group		Total
			1993	1995 & 1996	
OFFENDER DRUG NEEDS	NONE/NOT SERIOUS	Count % within GROUPS1 grouped by 1993 & 1995-96 Combined	11 10.8%	14 2.9%	25 4.3%
	NO INTERFERENCE W/FUNCTIONING	Count % within GROUPS1 grouped by 1993 & 1995-96 Combined		24 5.0%	24 4.1%
	SOME DISRUPTION OF FUNCTIONING	Count % within GROUPS1 grouped by 1993 & 1995-96 Combined	7 6.9%	44 9.1%	51 8.7%
	SERIOUS DISRUPTION OF FUNCTIONING	Count % within GROUPS1 grouped by 1993 & 1995-96 Combined	84 82.4%	401 83.0%	485 82.9%
Total		Count % within GROUPS1 grouped by 1993 & 1995-96 Combined	102 100.0%	483 100.0%	585 100.0%

* Significant at P<.001.

			Experimental Group		Total
			1993 data	1995 & 1996 data	
RECORD OF ABUSE AS A CHILD	NO	Count % within Experimental Group	92 100.0%	272 94.1%	364 95.5%
	YES	Count % within Experimental Group		17 5.9%	17 4.5%
Total		Count % within Experimental Group	92 100.0%	289 100.0%	381 100.0%

* Significant at P<.05

			Experimental Group		Total
			1993	1995 & 1996	
FORMER GANG INVOLVEMENT	NO	Count % within Experimental Group	99 99.0%	453 96.6%	552 97.0%
	YES	Count % within Experimental Group	1 1.0%	16 3.4%	17 3.0%
Total		Count % within Experimental Group	100 100.0%	469 100.0%	569 100.0%

*No significant difference between groups.

			Experimental Group		Total
			1993 data	1995 & 1996 data	
CURRENT GANG INVOLVEMENT	NO	Count % within Experimental Group	98 98.0%	455 97.2%	553 97.4%
	YES	Count % within Experimental Group	2 2.0%	13 2.8%	15 2.6%
Total		Count % within Experimental Group	100 100.0%	468 100.0%	568 100.0%

*No significant difference between groups.

			Experimental Group		Total
			1993	1995 & 1996	
ELECTRONIC MONITORING	NO	Count % within Experimental Group	104 99.0%	465 89.6%	569 91.2%
	YES	Count % within Experimental Group	1 1.0%	54 10.4%	55 8.8%
Total		Count % within Experimental Group	105 100.0%	519 100.0%	624 100.0%

* Significant at P<.01.

			Experimental Group		Total
			1993	1995 & 1996	
DRUG TYPE CHARGED	Cocaine*	Count	83	362	445
		% within Experimental Group	79.0%	69.7%	71.3%
	MJ	Count	5	30	35
		% within Experimental Group	4.8%	5.8%	5.6%
	Heroin**	Count	3	64	67
		% within Experimental Group	2.9%	12.3%	10.7%
Stimulants	Count	3	29	32	
	% within Experimental Group	2.9%	5.6%	5.1%	
Other	Count	11	34	45	
	% within Experimental Group	10.5%	6.6%	7.2%	
Total		Count	105	519	624
		% within Experimental Group	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Significant at P<.05

** Significant at P<.01.

			Experimental Group		Total
			1993	1995 & 1996	
Recoded age at time of this arrest	18-25 Years Old	Count	24.8%	147	172
		% within Experimental Group	24.8%	29.4%	28.6%
	26-35 Years Old	Count	37	174	211
		% within Experimental Group	36.6%	34.8%	35.1%
	>35 Years Old	Count	39	179	218
		% within Experimental Group	38.6%	35.8%	36.3%
Total		Count	101	500	601
		% within Experimental Group	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*No significant difference between groups.

			Experimental Group		Total
			1993	1995 & 1996	
SUPERVISION INCL INCARC/ PRISON	NO	Count % within Experimental Group	85 81.0%	409 78.8%	494 79.2%
	YES	Count % within Experimental Group	20 19.0%	110 21.2%	130 20.8%
Total		Count % within Experimental Group	105 100.0%	519 100.0%	624 100.0%

*No significant difference between groups.

			Experimental Group		Total
			1993	1995 & 1996	
PRIOR ADULT CONV OR JUVENILE ADJUD	NO	Count % within Experimental Group	69 65.7%	288 55.5%	357 57.2%
	YES	Count % within Experimental Group	36 34.3%	231 44.5%	267 42.8%
Total		Count % within Experimental Group	105 100.0%	519 100.0%	624 100.0%

*Significant at P<.05

			Experimental Group		Total
			1993	1995 & 1996	
PRIOR DRUG OFFENSE	NO	Count % within Experimental Group	83 79.0%	363 69.9%	446 71.5%
	YES	Count % within Experimental Group	22 21.0%	156 30.1%	178 28.5%
Total		Count % within Experimental Group	105 100.0%	519 100.0%	624 100.0%

*No significant difference between groups.

			Experimental Group		Total
			1993	1995 & 1996	
Recoded Education	< High School	Count	38	217	255
		% within Experimental Group	38.8%	43.9%	43.1%
	High School Graduate	Count	47	158	205
		% within Experimental Group	48.0%	32.0%	34.6%
	> High School	Count	13	119	132
		% within Experimental Group	13.3%	24.1%	22.3%
Total		Count	98	494	592
		% within Experimental Group	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Significant at P<.01

			Experimental Group		Total
			1 1993 data	2 1995 & 1996 data	
PROBATION PLACEMENT	regular probation	Count	97	417	514
		% within Experimental Group	97.0%	82.9%	85.2%
	intensive supervision	Count	3	86	89
		% within Experimental Group	3.0%	17.1%	14.8%
Total		Count	100	503	603
		% within Experimental Group	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Significant at P<.001

Appendix F

Comparison of Drug Court Cases by Completion Status

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Sig. Level
RECODED CRIMINAL HISTORY SCORE	Drug Court Graduates	143	.69	1.18	P < .001
	Probation Completers	114	1.01	1.31	
	Non- Completers	262	1.75	1.56	
AGE AT 1ST ARREST	Drug Court Graduates	136	25.00	8.06	P < .001
	Probation Completers	110	23.48	8.86	
	Non- Completers	249	21.02	6.17	
LAST GRADE COMPLETED	Drug Court Graduates	135	12.14	2.48	P < .01
	Probation Completers	110	11.67	2.17	
	Non- Completers	250	11.26	2.85	
OFFENDER MH NEEDS	Drug Court Graduates	132	.37	.86	N.S.
	Probation Completers	101	.52	.95	
	Non- Completers	232	.42	.90	
OFFENDER ALC NEEDS	Drug Court Graduates	135	1.86	1.04	N.S.
	Probation Completers	108	1.93	1.04	
	Non- Completers	235	1.93	1.01	
OFFENDER DRUG NEEDS	Drug Court Graduates	136	2.68	.76	N.S.
	Probation Completers	110	2.65	.79	
	Non- Completers	237	2.78	.59	
BEHAVIOR SEVERITY SCORE	Drug Court Graduates	143	1.00	.00	N.S.
	Probation Completers	114	1.00	.00	
	Non- Completers	262	1.01	.20	
LSI SCORE	Drug Court Graduates	122	19.39	7.70	P < .001
	Probation Completers	88	22.03	8.66	
	Non- Completers	166	27.50	8.47	
DAST SCORE	Drug Court Graduates	61	4.36	3.79	P < .01
	Probation Completers	36	6.17	3.95	
	Non- Completers	88	6.59	4.76	
ADS SCORE	Drug Court Graduates	61	1.62	3.46	N.S.
	Probation Completers	36	.94	1.90	
	Non- Completers	88	3.02	6.46	
DISRUPT SUBSCALE SCORE	Drug Court Graduates	117	9.67	13.52	P < .01
	Probation Completers	85	12.64	13.04	
	Non- Completers	157	15.53	17.53	
DEFENSE SUBSCALE SCORE	Drug Court Graduates	116	8.98	4.13	N.S.
	Probation Completers	85	8.54	3.80	
	Non- Completers	156	8.35	4.17	
AGE AT ARREST	Drug Court Graduates	143	32.31	9.56	P < .05
	Probation Completers	113	32.92	8.80	
	Non- Completers	262	30.22	8.06	

			Drug Court/Probation Completion Status			Total
			Drug Court Graduates	95-96 Probation Completers	95-96 Non-Completers	
SEX	MALE	Count	102	81	217	400
		% within Completion Status	71.3%	71.1%	82.8%	77.1%
	FEMALE	Count	41	33	45	119
		% within Completion Status	28.7%	28.9%	17.2%	22.9%
Total		Count	143	114	262	519
		% within Completion Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Significant at P < .01

			Drug Court/Probation Completion Status			Total
			Drug Court Graduates	95-96 Probation Completers	95-96 Non-Completers	
ETHNICITY	ANGLO	Count	62	41	44	147
		% within Completion Status	44.3%	36.9%	16.8%	28.7%
	BLACK	Count	26	37	135	198
		% within Completion Status	18.6%	33.3%	51.5%	38.6%
	HISPANIC	Count	52	33	81	166
		% within Completion Status	37.1%	29.7%	30.9%	32.4%
	OTHER	Count			2	2
		% within Completion Status			.8%	.4%
Total		Count	140	111	262	513
		% within Completion Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Significant at P < .001

			Drug Court/Probation Completion Status			Total
			Drug Court Graduates	95-96 Probation Completers	95-96 Non-Completers	
MARITAL STATUS	SINGLE	Count	62	46	142	250
		% within Completion Status	45.6%	43.0%	55.9%	50.3%
	MARRIED	Count	31	21	32	84
		% within Completion Status	22.8%	19.6%	12.6%	16.9%
	SEP/DIV	Count	36	31	53	120
% within Completion Status		26.5%	29.0%	20.9%	24.1%	
WIDOWED	Count		1	3	4	
	% within Completion Status		.9%	1.2%	.8%	
COMMON LAW	Count	7	8	24	39	
	% within Completion Status	5.1%	7.5%	9.4%	7.8%	
Total	Count	136	107	254	497	
	% within Completion Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

*Significant at P < .05

			Drug Court/Probation Completion Status			Total
			Drug Court Graduates	95-96 Probation Completers	95-96 Non-Completers	
EMPLOYMENT AT ARREST	FULL TIME	Count	57	46	55	158
		% within Completion Status	40.4%	40.7%	21.6%	31.0%
	PART TIME	Count	16	8	20	44
		% within Completion Status	11.3%	7.1%	7.8%	8.6%
UNEMPLOYED	Count	62	53	154	269	
	% within Completion Status	44.0%	46.9%	60.4%	52.8%	
SPORADIC	Count	6	6	26	38	
	% within Completion Status	4.3%	5.3%	10.2%	7.5%	
Total	Count	141	113	255	509	
	% within Completion Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

*Significant at P < .001

			Drug Court/Probation Completion Status			Total
			Drug Court Graduates	95-96 Probation Completers	95-96 Non-Completers	
RESIDENTIAL STABILITY	CONTINUOUSLY RESIDED AT SAME ADDRESS	Count % within Completion Status	54 48.6%	38 41.3%	61 29.9%	153 37.6%
	MOVED 1,2,3, TIMES	Count % within Completion Status	44 39.6%	44 47.8%	78 38.2%	166 40.8%
	MOVED 4 OR MORE TIMES	Count % within Completion Status	13 11.7%	10 10.9%	65 31.9%	88 21.6%
Total		Count % within Completion Status	111 100.0%	92 100.0%	204 100.0%	407 100.0%

*Significant at P < .001

			Drug Court/Probation Completion Status			Total
			Drug Court Graduates	95-96 Probation Completers	95-96 Non-Completers	
OFFENDER MH NEEDS	NONE/NOT SERIOUS	Count % within Completion Status	108 81.8%	73 72.3%	183 78.9%	36 78.3%
	NO INTERFERENCE W/FUNCTIONING	Count % within Completion Status	7 5.3%	11 10.9%	17 7.3%	3 7.5%
	SOME DISRUPTION OF FUNCTIONING	Count % within Completion Status	9 6.8%	9 8.9%	15 6.5%	3 7.1%
	SERIOUS DISRUPTION OF FUNCTIONING	Count % within Completion Status	8 6.1%	8 7.9%	17 7.3%	3 7.1%
Total		Count % within Completion Status	132 100.0%	101 100.0%	232 100.0%	46 100.0%

*Significant at P < .01

			Drug Court/Probation Completion Status			Total
			Drug Court Graduates	95-96 Probation Completers	95-96 Non-Completers	
OFFENDER ALCOHOL NEEDS	NONE/NOT SERIOUS	Count % within Completion Status	14 10.4%	11 10.2%	20 8.5%	4 9.4%
	NO INTERFERENCE W/FUNCTIONING	Count % within Completion Status	42 31.1%	29 26.9%	67 28.5%	13 28.9%
	SOME DISRUPTION OF FUNCTIONING	Count % within Completion Status	28 20.7%	25 23.1%	57 24.3%	11 23.0%
	SERIOUS DISRUPTION OF FUNCTIONING	Count % within Completion Status	51 37.8%	43 39.8%	91 38.7%	18 38.7%
Total		Count % within Completion Status	135 100.0%	108 100.0%	235 100.0%	47 100.0%

* No Significant Difference

			Drug Court/Probation Completion Status			Total
			Drug Court Graduates	95-96 Probation Completers	95-96 Non-Completers	
OFFENDER DRUG NEEDS	NONE/NOT SERIOUS	Count % within Completion Status	6 4.4%	4 3.6%	4 1.7%	1 2.9%
	NO INTERFERENCE W/FUNCTIONING	Count % within Completion Status	6 4.4%	9 8.2%	9 3.8%	2 5.0%
	SOME DISRUPTION OF FUNCTIONING	Count % within Completion Status	14 10.3%	9 8.2%	21 8.9%	4 9.1%
	SERIOUS DISRUPTION OF FUNCTIONING	Count % within Completion Status	110 80.9%	88 80.0%	203 85.7%	40 83.0%
Total		Count % within Completion Status	136 100.0%	110 100.0%	237 100.0%	48 100.0%

* No Significant Difference

			Drug Court/Probation Completion Status			Total
			Drug Court Graduates	95-96 Probation Completers	95-96 Non-Completers	
RECORD OF ABUSE AS A CHILD	NO	Count % within Completion Status	75 92.6%	59 95.2%	138 94.5%	272 94.1%
	YES	Count % within Completion Status	6 7.4%	3 4.8%	8 5.5%	17 5.9%
Total		Count % within Completion Status	81 100.0%	62 100.0%	146 100.0%	289 100.0%

* No Significant Difference

			Drug Court/Probation Completion Status			Total
			Drug Court Graduates	95-96 Probation Completers	95-96 Non-Completers	
FORMER GANG INVOLVEMENT	NO	Count % within Completion Status	134 98.5%	103 98.1%	216 94.7%	453 96.6%
	YES	Count % within Completion Status	2 1.5%	2 1.9%	12 5.3%	16 3.4%
Total		Count % within Completion Status	136 100.0%	105 100.0%	228 100.0%	469 100.0%

* No Significant Difference

			Drug Court/Probation Completion Status			Total
			Drug Court Graduates	95-96 Probation Completers	95-96 Non-Completers	
CURRENT GANG INVOLVEMENT	NO	Count % within Completion Status	132 97.1%	104 99.0%	219 96.5%	455 97.2%
	YES	Count % within Completion Status	4 2.9%	1 1.0%	8 3.5%	13 2.8%
Total		Count % within Completion Status	136 100.0%	105 100.0%	227 100.0%	468 100.0%

* No Significant Difference

			Drug Court/Probation Completion Status			Total
			Drug Court Graduates	95-96 Probation Completers	95-96 Non-Completers	
ELECTRONIC MONITORING	NO	Count % within Completion Status	131 91.6%	101 88.6%	233 88.9%	465 89.6%
	YES	Count % within Completion Status	12 8.4%	13 11.4%	29 11.1%	54 10.4%
Total		Count % within Completion Status	143 100.0%	114 100.0%	262 100.0%	519 100.0%

* No Significant Difference

			Drug Court/Probation Completion Status			Total
			Drug Court Graduates	95-96 Probation Completers	95-96 Non-Completers	
UPS	NO	Count % within Completion Status	24 16.8%	25 21.9%	77 29.4%	126 24.3%
	YES	Count % within Completion Status	119 83.2%	89 78.1%	185 70.6%	393 75.7%
Total		Count % within Completion Status	143 100.0%	114 100.0%	262 100.0%	519 100.0%

* Significant at $P < .05$

			Drug Court/Probation Completion Status			Total
			Drug Court Graduates	95-96 Probation Completers	95-96 Non-Completers	
Instrument Derived Treatment level	No Treatment	Count % within Completion Status	7 6.6%	5 6.3%		12 3.7%
	UA's, Drug and Alcohol Education	Count % within Completion Status	31 29.2%	19 23.8%	14 10.1%	64 19.8%
	Weekly Outpatient	Count % within Completion Status	37 34.9%	21 26.3%	29 21.0%	87 26.9%
	Intensive Outpatient	Count % within Completion Status	25 23.6%	22 27.5%	53 38.4%	100 30.9%
	Intensive Residential	Count % within Completion Status	5 4.7%	10 12.5%	28 20.3%	43 13.3%
	Therapeutic Community	Count % within Completion Status		3 3.8%	12 8.7%	15 4.6%
	Assess for Psychopathy	Count % within Completion Status	1 .9%		2 1.4%	3 .9%
	Total	Count % within Completion Status	106 100.0%	80 100.0%	138 100.0%	324 100.0%

* Significant at P < .001

			Drug Court/Probation Completion Status			Total
			Drug Court Graduates	95-96 Probation Completers	95-96 Non-Completers	
DRUG TYPE CHARGED	Cocaine	Count	89	80	193	362
		% within Completion Status	62.2%	70.2%	73.7%	69.7%
	MJ*	Count	14	7	9	30
		% within Completion Status	9.8%	6.1%	3.4%	5.8%
	Heroin**	Count	7	13	44	64
		% within Completion Status	4.9%	11.4%	16.8%	12.3%
Stimulants	Count	11	9	9	29	
	% within Completion Status	7.7%	7.9%	3.4%	5.6%	
Other	Count	22	5	7	34	
	% within Completion Status	15.4%	4.4%	2.7%	6.6%	
Total	Count	143	114	262	519	
	% within Completion Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

* Marijuana Significant at P < .05

** Heroin Significant at P < .001

			Drug Court/Probation Completion Status			Total
			Drug Court Graduates	95-96 Probation Completers	95-96 Non-Completers	
Recoded LSI Scores	0-18 (LOW)	Count	52	35	21	108
		% within Completion Status	42.6%	39.8%	12.7%	28.7%
	19-28 (MED)	Count	51	31	63	145
		% within Completion Status	41.8%	35.2%	38.0%	38.6%
	29-54 (HIGH)	Count	19	22	82	123
		% within Completion Status	15.6%	25.0%	49.4%	32.7%
Total	Count	122	88	166	376	
	% within Completion Status	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

* Significant at P < .001

			Drug Court/Probation Completion Status			Total
			Drug Court Graduates	95-96 Probation Completers	95-96 Non-Completers	
Recoded age at time of this arrest	18-25 Years Old	Count % within Completion Status	40 29.0%	23 21.7%	84 32.8%	147 29.4%
	26-35 Years Old	Count % within Completion Status	41 29.7%	38 35.8%	95 37.1%	174 34.8%
	>35 Years Old	Count % within Completion Status	57 41.3%	45 42.5%	77 30.1%	179 35.8%
Total		Count % within Completion Status	138 100.0%	106 100.0%	256 100.0%	500 100.0%

* Significant at P < .05

			Drug Court/Probation Completion Status			Total
			Drug Court Graduates	95-96 Probation Completers	95-96 Non-Completers	
Recoded Education	< High School	Count % within Completion Status	43 31.9%	40 36.4%	134 53.8%	217 43.9%
	GED	Count % within Completion Status	15 11.1%	7 6.4%	32 12.9%	54 10.9%
	High School Graduate	Count % within Completion Status	28 20.7%	34 30.9%	42 16.9%	104 21.1%
	> High School	Count % within Completion Status	49 36.3%	29 26.4%	41 16.5%	119 24.1%
Total		Count % within Completion Status	135 100.0%	110 100.0%	249 100.0%	494 100.0%

* Significant at P < .001

			Drug Court/Probation Completion Status			Total
			Drug Court Graduates	95-96 Probation Completers	95-96 Non-Completers	
PRIOR ADULT CONVICTIONS OR JUVENILE ADJUDICATIONS	NO	Count % within Completion Status	106 74.1%	69 60.5%	113 43.1%	288 55.5%
	YES	Count % within Completion Status	37 25.9%	45 39.5%	149 56.9%	231 44.5%
Total		Count % within Completion Status	143 100.0%	114 100.0%	262 100.0%	519 100.0%

* Significant at P < .001

			Drug Court/Probation Completion Status			Total
			Drug Court Graduates	95-96 Probation Completers	95-96 Non-Completers	
PRIOR DRUG OFFENSE	NO	Count % within Completion Status	117 81.8%	85 74.6%	161 61.5%	363 69.9%
	YES	Count % within Completion Status	26 18.2%	29 25.4%	101 38.5%	156 30.1%
Total		Count % within Completion Status	143 100.0%	114 100.0%	262 100.0%	519 100.0%

* Significant at P < .001

Appendix G

Resources Regarding Multiculturalism

Africentric-specific resources:

- Anderson, L. P. (1991). Acculturative stress: A theory of relevance to Black Americans. Clinical Psychology Review, 11, 685-702.
- Asante, M. K. & Asante, K. W. (1992). African culture: The rhythms of unity. Trenton, NJ: African World Press.
- Asante, M.K. (1980). Afrocentricity: The theory of social change. Buffalo, NY: Amulefi.
- Asante, M.K. (1987). The Afrocentric idea. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Asante, M.K. (1988). Afrocentricity. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.
- Baldwin, J. (1991). African (Black) Psychology: Issues and Synthesis. In Reginald L. Jones (Ed.), Black Psychology. Berkeley, CA: Cobb & Henry.
- Bell, P. (1990). Chemical Dependency and the African-American: Counseling strategies and community issues. Center City, MN: Hazelden.
- Brisbane, F.L. (1992). Culture-based counseling for people of African–American ancestry: Africentric counseling. In J.U. Gordon (Ed), Multiculturalism in alcohol and other drug abuse services. Topeka, KS: Kansas Multicultural Association on Substance Abuse.
- Burlew, A. K., Banks, W. C., McAdoo, H. P. & Azibo, D. A. (1992). African American psychology: Theory, research and practice. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cross, W.E. (1991). Shades of Black: Diversity in African-American Identity. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Dixon, P. (1998). African self-consciousness, misorientation behavior, and a self-destructive disorder: African American male crack-cocaine users. Journal of Black Psychology, 24(2).
- Foulks, E.F., & Pena, J.M. (1995). Ethnicity and Psychotherapy: A component in the treatment of cocaine addiction in African Americans. Psychiatric Clinics of North America, 18(3).
- Gray, L. E. (1991). Mental health of African Americans: Research trends and directions. In R. L. Jones (Ed). Black Psychology. Berkeley, CA: Cobbs and Henry Publisher.
- Helms, J.E. (1984). Toward a theoretical explanation of the effects of race on counseling: A Black and White model. Counseling Psychologist. 12, 153-165.
- Jackson, A. M. (1982). Psychosocial aspects of the therapeutic process. In S. M. Turner & R. T. Jones (Eds.). Behavior therapy and Black populations: Psychosocial issues and empirical findings. New York: Plenum Publishing Corp.
- Jackson, A.M. (1983). Treatment issues for Black patients. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, and Practice, 20, 143-151.
- Jackson, M.S., Stephens, R.C., & Smith, R.L. (1997). Afrocentric Treatment in Residential Substance Abuse Care. Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 14(1).
- Jenkins, A. H. (1994). The psychology of African Americans: A humanistic approach, 2nd Ed. Needham, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Lee, C. (1991). Counseling African Americans: From theory to practice. In Reginald L. Jones (Ed.), Black Psychology. Berkeley, CA: Cobb & Henry.

- Longshore, D., Grills, C., Anglin, M.D., & Annon, T.A. (1997) Desire for help among African American drug users. Journal of Drug Issues. 27(4).
- Longshore, D., Grills, C., Annon, T.A. & Grady, R. (1998) Promoting recovery from drug abuse: an Africentric intervention. Journal of Black Studies. 28(3).
- Myers, L.J. (1988). Understanding an Afrocentric world view: Introduction to an optimal psychology. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Nobles, W. (1986). African Psychology: Toward its reclamation, reascension and revitalization. Oakland: Black Family Institute.
- Phillips, F.B. (1990). NTU psychotherapy: An Africentric Approach. Journal of Black Psychology, 17(1).
- Rowe, D. & Grills, C. (1993). African-Centered Drug Treatment: An Alternative Conceptual Paradigm for Drug Counseling with African-American Clients. Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, 25(1).
- Schiele, Jerome H. (1996). Afrocentricity: An emerging paradigm in social work practice. Social Work, 41(3).
- Thorn, G.R & Sarata, B. (1998). Psychotherapy with African American men: What we know and what we need to know. Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development. 26(4).
- Wade, J.C. (1994). Substance Abuse: Implication for counseling African-American men. Journal of Mental Health Counseling. 16(4).
- Williams, R.L. (1981). The Collective Black Mind: An Afro-centric theory of black personality. St. Louis: Williams & Associates, Inc.

Resources regarding multiculturalism in General:

Adler, L.L. & Gielen, U.P. (Eds.). Cross-Cultural Topics in Psychology. Westport CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Aponte, J. F., Rivers, R. Y. & Wohl, J. (1995). Psychological interventions and cultural diversity. Needham, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Berry, J.W., Poortinga, Y.H., & Dasen, P.R. (1992). Cross-cultural psychology: Research and applications. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Cultural Competence Standards in Managed Care Mental Health Services (1998). Rockville, MD. Center for Mental Health Services. Available at:
<http://www.mentalhealth.org/publications/allpubs/SMA00-3457/glossary.htm>

Dana, R. H. (1993). Multicultural Assessment Perspectives for Professional Psychology. Needham, MA: Allyn and Bacon Publishers.

De Leon, G., Melnick, G., Schoket, D., Jainchill, N. (1993). Is the Therapeutic Community Culturally Relevant? Findings on Race/Ethnic Differences in Retention in Treatment. Journal of Psychoactive Drugs. 25(1).

Finn, P. (1994). Addressing the Needs of Cultural Minorities in Drug Treatment. Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment. 11(4).

Gordon J.U. (1992). Managing Multiculturalism in Substance Abuse Services. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Gordon, J.U. (1992). Multiculturalism in alcohol and other drug abuse services. Topeka, KS: Kansas Multicultural Association on Substance Abuse.

Gordon, J.U. (1993). A culturally specific approach to ethnic minority young adults. In E. Freeman (Ed.), Substance abuse treatment: A family systems perspective. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Jackson, A. M. (1973). Psychotherapy: Factors associated with the race of the therapist. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice. 10, 273-277.

Lee, C. C. (Ed.). (1994). Counseling for diversity: A guide for counselors and related professionals. Needham, MA: Allyn and Bacon Publications.

Locke, D.C. (1992). Increasing multicultural understanding: A comprehensive model. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Longshore, D., Hsieh, S., Anglin, M.D., & Annon, T.A. (1992). Ethnic patterns in drug abuse treatment utilization. Journal of the Mental Health Administration, 19(3).

Lopez, S.R. and Hernandez, P. (1987). How culture is considered in evaluations of psychopathology. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease. 176(10).

Mental Health: Culture, Race, and Ethnicity a Supplement to Mental Health: A Report of the Surgeon General (2001). Rockville, MD. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Public Health Service, Office of the Surgeon General. Available at:
<http://www.surgeongeneral.gov/library/mentalhealth/cre>

- Nguyen, T.S. (2001). Diagnostic Issues in Cross-Cultural Settings. Chicago, IL. Center for Multicultural and Multilingual Mental Health Services. Available at: <http://www.mc-mimhs.org/cultures/issueessays/dissues.htm>
- Nurco, D.N., Hanlon, T.E., & Kinlock, T.W. (1990, March). Offenders, drugs, crime and treatment: Literature review. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance.
- O'Connell, T. (1991). Treatment of Minorities. Drug and Alcohol Dependence, 15(10).
- Overview of Cultural Diversity and Mental Health Services. In Mental Health: A Report to the Surgeon General. (1999). Rockville, MD. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Office of the Surgeon General. Available at: <http://www.surgeongeneral.gov/library/mentalhealth/chapter2/sec8.html>
- Paniagua, F.A. (1994). Assessing and treating culturally diverse clients. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ponterotto, J. G., Casas, J. M., Suzuki, L. A. & Alexander, C. M. (Eds.). (1995). Handbook of multicultural counseling. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ramirez, M. (1991). Psychotherapy and counseling with minorities: A cognitive approach to individual and cultural differences. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Rasmussen, S. (2000). Addiction Treatment Theory and Practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ridley, C. R. (1994). Overcoming unintentional racism in counseling and therapy: A practitioner's guide to intentional intervention. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Screening and Assessment for Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Among Adults in the Criminal Justice System: Treatment Improvement Protocol (TIP) Series 7. Rockville, MD. U.S. Department Of Health And Human Services, Public Health Service, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Center for Substance Abuse Treatment.
- Spicer, J. (1989). Counseling ethnic minorities. Center City, MN: Hazelden Educational Materials/Hazelden Foundation.
- Sue, D. & Sue, D. (1990). Counseling the Culturally Different: Theory and practice. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sue, S. & Zane, N. (1987). The role of culture and cultural techniques in psychotherapy. American Psychologist. 42, 37-45.
- Sue, S., Arredondo, P. & McDavis, R. J. (1992). Multicultural counseling competencies and standards: A call to the profession. Journal of Counseling and Development. 70, 477-486.
- Sue, Stanley. (1988). Psychotherapeutic Services for Ethnic Minorities Two Decades of Research Findings. American Psychologist. 43(4).
- Sue, Stanley. (1998). In Search of Cultural Competence in Psychotherapy and Counseling. American Psychologist. 53(4).
- Treatment for Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse: Opportunities for Coordination: Technical Assistance Publication Series 11. (1994). Rockville, MD. U.S. Department Of Health And Human Services, Public Health Service, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Center for Substance Abuse Treatment. Available at <http://www.treatment.org/Taps/Tab11/tap11toc.html>