

# Federal Probation



Tough Boyz & Trouble ..... *Patrice Gaines-Carter*

Probation and the Drunk Driver: A Cost  
of Being "MADD" ..... *Patrick Kinkade*  
*Matthew C. Leone*  
*Thomas Wacker*

Co-dependency and Probation ..... *Mickie C. Walker*

Following the Penological Pendulum: The  
Survival of Rehabilitation ..... *David Shichor*

Understanding and Sanctioning the White  
Collar Offender ..... *Stephen J. Rackmill*

Victim Age as a Basis for Profiling Sex  
Offenders ..... *Andrei Kuznestov*  
*Timothy A. Pierson*  
*Bruce Harry*

Reflections of a Former Corrections  
Director: Are Offenders Tougher Today? ..... *Walter J. Dickey*

The Supreme Court and Prison Excessive Use of  
Force Cases: Does One Test Fit All? ..... *Rolando V. del Carmen*

Characteristics and Adjustment of Federal  
Inmates Enrolled in a Comprehensive  
Residential Drug Treatment Program ..... *Glenn D. Walters*  
*Diane Whitaker*  
*Shella Dial*  
*Pamela Dairsow*  
*James Cianciulli*

The State of Jails in America ..... *Michael T. Charles*  
*Sesha Kethineni*  
*Jeffrey L. Thompson*

Looking at the Law—Credit for Official Detention,  
Restoration of Right to Possess Firearm ..... *David N. Adair, Jr.*

JUNE 1992

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

138291-  
138294

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been  
granted by

Federal Probation

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

# Federal Probation

A JOURNAL OF CORRECTIONAL PHILOSOPHY AND PRACTICE

Published by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts

VOLUME LVI

JUNE 1992

NUMBER 2

## This Issue in Brief

AUG 31 1992

### ACQUISITIONS

**Tough Boyz & Trouble.**—In an article subtitled "Those Girls Waiting Outside the D.C. Jail Remind Me of Myself," *Washington Post* reporter Patrice Gaines-Carter writes about the young women who love incarcerated men—the women who find a certain strength and power in men who operate outside the law. In a candid reminiscence of her own youthful attraction to "young black men who toted guns," the author describes how she "had to spend a summer in jail to discover the truths that serve me now."

**Probation and the Drunk Driver: A Cost of Being "MADD."**—In 1982, California instituted laws designed to severely sanction persons convicted of drunk driving. Prior research has indicated that these laws have had a negative impact on California's courts and jails. Authors Patrick Kinkade, Matthew C. Leone, and Thomas Wacker report on research into the effects the tough DUI laws have had on probation in California and the differing experiences of specific counties.

**Co-dependency and Probation.**—Chemical dependency, the dependence on drugs and/or alcohol, destroys many lives: not only the life of the chemical user, but the lives of persons connected to the user as well. Author Mickie C. Walker describes how chemical dependency affects the family system, causing rules, behaviors, roles, attitudes, and defense mechanisms to change so that family members can cope with the stress of chemical dependency. How family members might adversely affect probation work is discussed.

**Following the Penological Pendulum: The Survival of Rehabilitation.**—Author David Shichor reviews the changes in penological thinking and control policies that have occurred in the last two decades. This article focuses on the analysis of rehabilitation as a leading punishment principle that declined during that period of time and argues that there are several factors which contribute to its survival and its sustained importance in Western and American penology. These factors include an enduring public support and an acceptance by social scientists.

**Understanding and Sanctioning the White Collar Offender.**—Recent revelations of insider training and savings and loan defaults have focused public attention on white collar crime. Controversy surrounds this type of crime and the elite offenders who commit it. Author Stephen J. Rackmill defines white collar crime, discusses elements common to such crimes, and explains who the victims are and how

### CONTENTS

Tough Boyz & Trouble .....	Patrice Gaines-Carter	3
Probation and the Drunk Driver: A Cost of Being "MADD" .....	Patrick Kinkade Matthew C. Leone Thomas Wacker	6
Co-dependency and Probation .....	Mickie C. Walker	16
Following the Penological Pendulum: The Survival of Rehabilitation .....	David Shichor	19
Understanding and Sanctioning the White Collar Offender .....	Stephen J. Rackmill	26
Victim Age as a Basis for Profiling Sex Offenders .....	Andrei Kuznestov Timothy A. Pierson Bruce Harry	34
Reflections of a Former Corrections Director: Are Offenders Tougher Today? .....	Walter J. Dickey	39
The Supreme Court and Prison Excessive Use of Force Cases: Does One Test Fit All? .....	Rolando V. del Carmen	44
Characteristics and Adjustment of Federal Inmates Enrolled in a Comprehensive Residential Drug Treatment Program .....	Glenn D. Walters Diane Whitaker Shella Dial Pamela Dairsow James Cianciulli	48
The State of Jails in America .....	Michael T. Charles Sesha Kethineni Jeffrey L. Thompson	56
Departments		
Looking at the Law .....		63
Reviews of Professional Periodicals .....		69
Your Bookshelf on Review .....		77
It Has Come to Our Attention .....		84

# Characteristics and Adjustment of Federal Inmates Enrolled in a Comprehensive Residential Drug Treatment Program

BY GLENN D. WALTERS, DIANE WHITAKER, SHELLA DIAL,  
PAMELA DAIRSOW, AND JAMES CIANCIULLI\*

**T**HE PRESENT article is the second in a series of articles describing the development, implementation, and outcome of a 500-hour comprehensive residential drug program for Federal offenders (Walters, Heffron, Whitaker, & Dial, 1992). This program, known locally as the CHOICE program, was founded on the premise that criminality and drug abuse occur as a result of the choices an individual makes and the lifestyle which evolves as a means of supporting and justifying these life choices. The CHOICE program focuses on stimulating change in drug-involved offenders by encouraging responsibility, cultivating decision-making capabilities, instructing participants in basic social/coping skills, challenging previously held thoughts, beliefs, and values, and assisting subjects in the realization of a healthy substitute for their past drug and criminal lifestyles.

The CHOICE program is comprised of seven program components—Intake/Evaluation/Followup, Drug Education, Skills Development, Lifestyle Modification, Wellness, Responsibility, and Individualized Counseling—and participants can normally accumulate sufficient credit to graduate from the program within 40 weeks. The Intake/Evaluation/Followup component of the CHOICE program consists of an orientation (to include psychological and substance abuse testing), a 40-hour relapse prevention class, and a 20-hour prerelease program, while the Drug Education component embodies a 1-hour weekly update of topics ranging anywhere from new drugs of abuse, to AIDS, to the role of humor in recovery.

The Skills Development and Lifestyle Modification components of the CHOICE program embody courses conceived for the purpose of providing participants with the requisite skills and information necessary to

function crime- and drug-free in the community. The Skills Development component encompasses mandatory classes in problem-solving, emotions management, empathy/social communication skills, negotiation skills, values clarification, reality-based creative thinking, critical reasoning, goal-setting, and life/survival skills. In addition, elective courses in stress management, rational behavior therapy, transactional analysis, assertiveness training, and family issues are offered. The Lifestyle Modification component of the CHOICE program consists of an introductory class in lifestyle issues and advanced classes on the drug and criminal lifestyles.

The CHOICE program adopts the philosophy that responsibility and physical health are integral to the construction of a productive and successful noncriminal/nondrug lifestyle. For this reason program components in responsibility and wellness are included in the CHOICE program package. Participants can earn program credit by engaging in various responsibility-engendering activities such as assisting with the teaching of a class, receiving good work evaluations, and attending Alcoholics Anonymous/Narcotics Anonymous on a regular basis. On the wellness side of the equation, participants must successfully complete 25 hours of wellness training and attend at least five 4-hour wellness workshops held each month on such topics as nutrition, weight control, and dental hygiene. The seventh and final component incorporates individual or small group counseling conducted with a participant's assigned drug abuse treatment specialist.

The CHOICE program provides for a new approach to substance abuse treatment with an emphasis on teaching drug-abusing offenders the skills necessary to more efficiently manage their lives and rejection of the viewpoint that criminality and drug abuse are symptoms of an underlying disease over which the individual has no control. The central question at this point in time is whether a program founded on CHOICE principles is capable of achieving the stated goal of providing drug-abusing inmates with the skills and abilities necessary to allow them to deal more effectively and responsibly with life. While this question requires a long-term followup of CHOICE program graduates, an intermediate step is to examine

\*Dr. Walters is clinical psychologist, Federal Correctional Institution-Schuylkill. Ms. Whitaker and Ms. Dial are both drug treatment specialists, Ms. Dairsow is CHOICE program secretary, and Mr. Cianciulli is drug education specialist, Federal Correctional Institution-Fairton.

The opinions or assertions contained herein are the private views of the authors and should not be construed as official or as reflecting the views of the Department of Justice or Federal Bureau of Prisons. Correspondence concerning this article should be directed to Glenn D. Walters, Psychology Services, FCI-Schuylkill, P.O. Box 700, Minersville, PA 17954-0700.

the characteristics and in-program adjustment of CHOICE program participants as a means of ascertaining whether the program is attracting inmates with problems in both the criminality and drug abuse areas and whether these subjects are learning to deal with their problems more effectively while enrolled in the program. This, then, will be the focus of the present article.

### *Characteristics of CHOICE Program Participants*

The demographic characteristics of 132 inmates enrolled in the CHOICE program between March 1991 and February 1992 are outlined in table 1. As table 1 illustrates, the "average" CHOICE inmate was approximately 34 years of age, with 12 years of education, of average intellectual ability, of minority racial/ethnic status, and serving a 10-year sentence for a drug-related offense. For the purposes of further analysis this sample was broken down into three primary components: graduates (N= 15), current enrollees (N= 100), and subjects whose participation in the program had been terminated because of transfer, release, or failure to abide by the rules of the program

(N= 17). Statistical analysis of the demographic results for these three groups failed to reveal any significant differences except on marital status where graduates were less likely to have been single (33 percent) than either current enrollees (46 percent) or program terminators (59 percent).

### *Lifestyle Status of CHOICE Program Participants*

The criminal and drug lifestyle status of CHOICE program participants was assessed by means of the Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form (LCSF) and Drug Lifestyle Screening Interview (DLSI), respectively. The LCSF (Walters, White, & Denney, 1991) is a 14-item chart audit form designed to assess the four primary behavioral characteristics of lifestyle criminality—irresponsibility, self-indulgence, interpersonal intrusiveness, and social rule breaking—through a review of the subject's presentence investigation (PSI) report. The Irresponsibility section of the LCSF inquires as to whether the subject dropped out of high school prior to completing the 12th grade, has ever been cited for failure to pay child support, or has ever been fired or quit a job without warning. The

TABLE 1. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF 132 CHOICE PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Range</u>
Age	132	-	33.70	8.10	20-59
Education	132	-	11.75	1.90	6-18
Race					
White	34	25.8%			
Black	69	52.3%			
Hispanic	28	21.2%			
Other	1	0.8%			
Marital Status					
Single	61	46.2%			
Married	44	33.3%			
Divorced	24	18.2%			
Widowed	3	2.3%			
Offense					
Violent	6	4.5%			
Robbery	23	17.4%			
Property	5	3.8%			
Drug	88	66.7%			
Other	10	7.6%			
Sentence	132	-	9.76	11.92	1-99
Shipley IQ	130	-	104.48	5.54	77-126

Self-Indulgence section of the LCSF is comprised of items which assess a subject's past use of substances, marital history, and display of tattoos. The Interpersonal Intrusiveness section of the LCSF concerns itself with the intrusiveness (infringing on the rights and personal space of others) of the instant offense, the intrusiveness of past criminality, and physical abuse directed at significant others. The Social Rule Breaking section of the LCSF measures the number of prior arrests, the age at first arrest, and the presence of any past school disciplinary problems. LCSF results for the 132 CHOICE program participants are outlined in table 2.

Like the LCSF, the Drug Lifestyle Screening Interview (DLSI) is divided into four sections (Walters, 1992). The Irresponsibility/Pseudoresponsibility section of the DLSI asks whether individuals dropped out of school prior to completing the 12th grade, were ever fired from a job or quit a job without warning, ever encountered problems as a result of not paying their bills, ever been cited for failure to pay child support, or regularly neglected the psychological or emotional needs of loved ones. The Stress-Coping Imbalance section of the DLSI assesses a subject's level of subjective distress prior to becoming involved with drugs (antecedent stress) and again after 6 months of regu-

TABLE 2. LIFESTYLE CRIMINALITY SCREENING FORM SCORES FOR 132 CHOICE PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Range</u>
<b>I. Irresponsibility</b>	132	-	2.14	1.30	0-5
A. Nonsupport of Child (1)	32	24.2%			
B. School Drop-Out (1)	86	65.2%			
C. Longest Job Held					
< 6 months (2)	23	17.4%			
≥ 6 mo but < 2 yrs (1)	60	45.5%			
≥ 2 years (0)	49	37.1%			
D. Fired/Quit Job					
two or more times (2)	16	12.1%			
one time (1)	27	20.5%			
none reported (0)	89	67.4%			
<b>II. Self-Indulgence</b>	132	-	2.83	1.13	0-6
A. Drug Abuse History (2)	126	95.5%			
B. Marital Background					
≥ 2 divorces (2)	5	3.8%			
1 divorce/unmarried with child (1)	65	49.2%			
undivorced/single, no children (0)	62	47.0%			
C. Tattoos <sup>1</sup>					
extensive (2)	18	13.6%			
isolated (1)	14	10.6%			
none (0)	100	75.8%			
<b>III. Interpersonal Intrusiveness</b>	132	-	1.41	1.46	0-5
A. Intrusive Instant Offense (1)	31	23.5%			
B. Prior Intrusive Offenses					
three or more (2)	40	30.3%			

TABLE 2—(Continued)

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Range</u>
one or two (1)	35	26.5%			
none (0)	57	43.2%			
C. Use of Weapon During Instant Offense (1)	30	22.7%			
D. Physical Abuse of Significant Others (1)	9	6.8%			
IV. Social Rule Breaking	132	-	1.88	1.43	0-5
A. Prior Arrests					
five or more (2)	63	47.7%			
two to four (1)	34	25.8%			
one or none (0)	35	26.5%			
B. Age at First Arrest					
≤ 14 (2)	10	7.6%			
> 14 but < 19 (1)	42	31.8%			
≥ 19 (0)	80	60.6%			
C. School Disciplinary Problems (1)	26	19.7%			
LCSF Total Score	132	-	8.21	3.59	0-17

NOTE: The italicized number in parentheses following each item is the value assigned by the LCSF for a positive outcome on this particular item.

<sup>1</sup>Any tattoo on a black subject results in a score of two on this item.

lar drug usage (subsequent stress), compares the two stress levels, and inquires into a subject's habitual manner of dealing with stress. The Interpersonal Triviality section of the DLSI considers the subject's sphere of friends (drug-using versus non drug-using), inclination for drug-based rituals, and propensity to engage in frivolous (empty, meaningless) conversations. The Social Rule Breaking/Bending section of the DLSI is comprised of 10 items, half of which measure social rule breaking and half of which assess social rule bending (see table 3). The total score on this section is calculated by summing the total number of positive items and then dividing this figure by two. The drug lifestyle patterns of 114 CHOICE participants for whom DLSI results were available can be found in table 3.

Research has established that scores of 10 or higher on the LCSF and DLSI are strongly correlated with serious patterns of criminal conduct and drug abuse, respectively (Walters, 1992; Walters & Chlumsky, 1992; Walters et al., 1991). However, scores slightly

below this level may also signal the presence of significant problems with either crime or drugs. For this reason, scores between 7 and 9 on either the LCSF or DLSI are said to reflect possible lifestyle criminality/drug abuse, while scores above 9 are said to be indicative of probable lifestyle criminality/drug abuse. As the results from table 4 demonstrate, approximately one-third of the CHOICE sample fell into the probable lifestyle criminality group, while nearly two-thirds of the 114 subjects for whom DLSI data were available fell into the probable lifestyle drug abuse group. Though these differences may signify greater drug than criminal lifestyle involvement on the part of CHOICE program participants, it should be kept in mind that the LCSF and DLSI rely on divergent methodologies and so the interview format of the DLSI may allow for a more complete analysis of the primary behavioral characteristics than the LCSF which must rely on the completeness of the PSI report. The figures displayed in the final column of table 4 indicate that 73 percent of the sample scored out as probable life-



TABLE 3. DRUG LIFESTYLE SCREENING INTERVIEW SCORES FOR 114 CHOICE PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Range</u>
<b>I. Irresponsibility/ Pseudoresponsibility</b>	114	-	2.16	1.09	0-5
A. School Drop-Out (1)	81	71.1%			
B. Fired or Quit Job (1)	55	48.2%			
C. Failure to Pay Bills (1)	21	18.4%			
D. Failure to Pay Child Support (1)	15	13.2%			
E. Neglect Psychological Needs of Loved Ones (1)	74	64.9%			
<b>II. Stress-Coping Imbalance</b>	114	-	3.11	1.40	0-5
A. Antecedent Stress (1)	67	58.8%			
B. Subsequent Stress (1)	61	53.5%			
C. Increase in Stress (1)	52	45.6%			
D. Manner of Coping					
with drugs (2)	73	64.0%			
other escapism (1)	29	25.4%			
constructive (0)	12	10.5%			
<b>III. Interpersonal Triviality</b>	114	-	2.96	1.28	0-5
A. Drug-User Contacts (1)	100	87.7%			
B. Shift in Contacts (1)	40	35.1%			
C. Ritualization					
high (2)	37	32.5%			
moderate (1)	48	42.1%			
low (0)	29	25.4%			
D. Frivolous Communications (1)	77	67.5%			
<b>IV. Social Rule Breaking/ Bending</b>	114	-	2.20	1.16	0-5
A. Panhandling (SRBe-1)	10	8.8%			
B. Burglary (SRBr-1)	31	27.2%			
C. Lying to Family Members (SRBe-1)	49	43.0%			
D. Selling Drugs (SRBr-1)	96	84.2%			
E. School Suspensions/ Expulsions (SRBr-1)	58	50.9%			
F. Acting as a Go-Between in Drug Deal (SRBe-1)	75	65.8%			



TABLE 3—(Continued)

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>Range</u>
G. Writing Bad Checks ( <i>SRBe-1</i> )	15	13.2%			
H. Stealing Money from Mother/Father ( <i>SRBr-1</i> )	30	26.3%			
I. Social Rule Breaking Before Age 16 ( <i>SRBr-1</i> )	45	39.5%			
J. Social Rule Bending Before Age 16 ( <i>SRBe-1</i> )	49	43.0%			
DLSI Total Score	114	-	10.43	3.40	1-18

NOTE: The italicized number in parentheses following each item is the value assigned by the DLSI for a positive outcome on this particular item.

style criminals and/or drug abusers, while 94 percent of the sample attained a score of at least a 7 on either the LCSF or DLSI, symbolizing possible/probable lifestyle criminality and/or drug abuse. Such findings denote that the vast majority of CHOICE participants included in the present sample were appropriate for placement in a program like CHOICE.

#### *Disciplinary Adjustment of CHOICE Program Participants*

Since research has shown that both age (Flanagan, 1983) and race (Hewitt, Poole, & Regoli, 1984) correlate with measures of institution-based disciplinary adjustment, the 132 CHOICE program participants were matched with 132 nonparticipants from the same general inmate population on age, race, and time period to determine whether CHOICE participants were any less likely to encounter disciplinary problems over the course of their involvement in the program (mean time period= 7.2 months) than matched controls. The prevalence and incidence of disciplinary

reports received by CHOICE and control subjects are listed in table 5. A *t*-test for correlated groups revealed a significant difference between CHOICE and control subjects in terms of the incidence of disciplinary maladjustment, *t* (131)= 2.40, *p* < .05. The McNemar nonparametric test for two related samples revealed a difference in the prevalence of disciplinary infraction which approached statistical significance,  $\chi^2$  (1)= 3.69, *p*=.05. The primary limitation of this analysis is that it fails to account for possible initial differences in motivation between CHOICE and control inmates as an explanation for the observed outcome (i.e., CHOICE participants may have been more motivated to enroll in a drug program as well as stay out of trouble than control subjects).

#### *Further Issues*

Now that the CHOICE program has been in operation one full year several issues have surfaced with implications for the program's continued growth and

TABLE 4. POSSIBLE AND PROBABLE DIAGNOSES OF LIFESTYLE CRIMINALITY AND DRUG ABUSE

<u>Scores</u>	<u>Diagnostic Categories</u>	<u>LCSF (N= 132)</u>	<u>DLSI (N= 114)</u>	<u>LCSF/DLSI<sup>1</sup> (N= 114)</u>
0-6	No Drug/Criminal Lifestyle	48(36.4%)	13(11.4%)	7(6.1%)
7-9	Possible Drug/Criminal Lifestyle	38(28.8%)	29(25.4%)	24(21.1%)
10+	Probable Drug/Criminal Lifestyle	46(34.8%)	72(63.2%)	83(72.8%)

<sup>1</sup>Combined category in which higher of two scores (LCSF or DLSI) is considered.

NOTE: First number is the frequency, and second number (in parentheses) is the percent.

TABLE 5. PREVALENCE AND INCIDENCE OF DISCIPLINARY REPORTS FOR 132 CHOICE PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS AND 132 MATCHED CONTROLS

	<u>CHOICE Program</u> <u>Participants</u>	<u>Matched</u> <u>Controls</u>
Prevalence of Disciplinary Infraction (Frequency)	0.17	0.26
Incidence of Disciplinary Infraction (Rate)	0.22	0.49

future success. Staffing is one such issue. The CHOICE program demands a great deal from its personnel owing to the fact that staff, in addition to being thoroughly familiar with four or five classes, must be reasonably conversant with all 15 classes offered as part of the CHOICE curriculum because they never know when they may be called upon to replace a staff member who is ill, unavailable, or absent. The amount and variety of work required of staff may seem overwhelming at times and this lends itself to potential job "burnout." In order to guard against this possibility, consideration needs to be given to increasing the staffing guidelines of programs like CHOICE, while at the same time providing existing staff with incentives for continued productivity.

A related concern is that programs along the lines of CHOICE require a great deal of support from the prison administration to remain viable. Although the CHOICE program has enjoyed a maximal level of support from the administration at FCI-Fairton, this may not be the case in all institutions or in all prison systems. In fact, there have been instances in the past where certain programs were sabotaged before they ever had a realistic chance for success due to a lack of support from either the administration or line staff (Kassebaum, Ward, & Wilner, 1971; Zivan, 1966). For this reason, the continued support of both administrative and line staff is vital to the health of programs like CHOICE, for without such support any program, no matter how relevant or comprehensive, will surely fail.

Recruitment and retention are other matters which demand further attention. Initially the CHOICE program was receiving approximately 90 percent of its referrals from outside sources (i.e., other Federal institutions) and only 10 percent of its referrals from inside FCI-Fairton. Within 6 months, however, the situation had been transposed to where the vast majority of new enrollees were inmates who had referred themselves from the general inmate population at FCI-Fairton. This illustrates the importance of providing a program which is viewed by participants as meaningful and valid since these individuals were the ones generating interest in the program among the general inmate population. Not only has the CHOICE program experienced a high rate of retention during

its first year of operation (annual drop-out rate= 2.2 percent), but participants have become its primary source of new referrals. Considering both forms of recruitment, it should be noted that outside recruitment is enhanced by providing useful and accurate information to outside referral sources, while in-house recruitment is the natural consequence of offering a program which is viewed by participants as practical, valuable, and worthwhile.

No matter how good a program is, internal recruitment will be a problem if the program has a negative image in the eyes of general population inmates. Initially there were significant levels of misinformation about the CHOICE program and its participants on the part of both the general inmate population and some staff. Education and the provision of more accurate information helped alleviate many of these problems, but the behavior of inmates enrolled in the program was probably the single most important factor in preventing a build-up of negative opinion about the program from the general inmate population and line staff. As attested to by the inmate profiles found in tables 1 through 3, CHOICE participants were older and in many cases, more criminally sophisticated than the average inmate at FCI-Fairton. The role model status of many CHOICE participants therefore served to establish increased program credibility in the minds of general population inmates, while the good institutional adjustment of the majority of program participants (see section on disciplinary adjustment) convinced many line staff of the value of the program. Obviously, there continue to be problems with program self-image even up to the present time, but they have been greatly reduced in relation to the problems initially encountered.

A final issue requiring our attention at this juncture concerns the manner in which the program is received by certain segments of the general public. We have already seen how indispensable staff support and program reputation are important to the continued success of programs like CHOICE. However, our discussion would be incomplete if we were to ignore the issue of public relations. The CHOICE program, though it holds to a cognitive-behavioral/lifestyle philosophy of intervention, is founded on the principle of providing participants with as much information as

possible and the skills by which they might evaluate this information. This, of course, requires input from persons outside the program as part of the weekly Drug Update Series or monthly Wellness Workshops. Attempts to foster a working alliance with governmental and bureaucratic policy-makers can be important to the extent that these individuals provide the funds which keep initiatives like the CHOICE program afloat. The development of a positive public image is therefore just as relevant to the formation of a viable program of prison-based drug programming as institutional staff support and program reputation.

### Conclusion

This article has shown that the CHOICE program has attracted over 100 inmates in just 1 year of operation and that these individuals are, for the most part, appropriate for inclusion in a program like CHOICE by virtue of a past history of serious criminality and/or drug abuse. There are also indications that the disciplinary adjustment of active CHOICE program participants was superior to that of a group of matched controls sampled from the same general population of inmates. We must wait, however, to answer the more pertinent question of whether the post-program institutional and community adjustment of CHOICE program participants is superior to that of a comparable group of inmates who have never been enrolled in an institution-based comprehensive drug treatment program. As those of us involved in development of the

CHOICE program have come to learn, we have only begun to scratch the surface when it comes to understanding what works with drug-abusing criminal offenders, but initial indications suggest that the CHOICE program may have something to offer in this regard and that the founding principles of choice, responsibility, cognitive/life skills, and lifestyle are central to the program's potential success.

### REFERENCES

- Flanagan, T. J. (1983). Correlates of institutional misconduct among state prisoners: A research note. *Criminology*, 21, 29-39.
- Hewitt, J. D., Poole, E. D., & Regoli, R. M. (1984). Self-reported and observed rule-breaking in prison: A look at disciplinary response. *American Journal of Sociology*, 90, 437-447.
- Kassebaum, G., Ward, D. A., & Wilner, D. M. (1971). *Prison treatment and parole survival: An empirical assessment*. New York: John Wiley.
- Walters, G. D. (1992). *Discriminating between high and low volume substance abusers by means of the Drug Lifestyle Screening Interview*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Walters, G.D., & Chlumsky, M.L. (1992). The Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form and antisocial personality disorder: Predicting release outcome in a state prison sample. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 10.
- Walters, G. D., Heffron, M., Whitaker, D., & Dial, S. (1992). The CHOICE program: A comprehensive residential treatment program for drug-involved federal offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 36.
- Walters, G.D., White, T.W., & Denney, D. (1991). The Lifestyle Criminality Screening Form: Preliminary data. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 18, 406-418.
- Zivan, M. (1966). *Youth in trouble: A vocational approach*. Dobbs Ferry, NY: Children's Village.