



 Research Article

## ASSESSING POST-SENTENCING AND REOFFENSE OUTCOMES: A QUANTITATIVE STUDY OF A DRUG TREATMENT COURT IN A WESTERN CANADIAN CITY

**Journal Website:**

<https://theamericanjournals.com/index.php/tajpsc>

**Copyright:** Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 licence.

**Submission Date:** June 25, 2023, **Accepted Date:** June 30, 2023,

**Published Date:** July 05, 2023 |

**Crossref doi:** <https://doi.org/10.37547/tajpslc/Volume05Issue07-02>

**Michael Gorkoff**

Department of Criminal Justice, University of Winnipeg, Canada

### ABSTRACT

Drug Treatment Courts (DTCs) have emerged as an alternative approach to traditional criminal justice responses for individuals with substance use disorders. This quantitative study examines the post-sentencing and reoffense outcomes of a Drug Treatment Court in a Western Canadian city. The study analyzes data from a sample of individuals who participated in the DTC program, comparing their post-sentencing outcomes to a matched comparison group of individuals who went through the regular criminal justice process. Outcome measures include recidivism rates, substance use patterns, treatment completion rates, and social reintegration outcomes. The findings provide insights into the effectiveness of the Drug Treatment Court in reducing recidivism, improving treatment outcomes, and facilitating successful community reintegration among individuals with substance use disorders. The implications of these findings for policy, practice, and future research are discussed.

### KEYWORDS

Drug Treatment Court, substance use disorders, post-sentencing outcomes, reoffense, recidivism, treatment completion, social reintegration, Western Canadian city.

### INTRODUCTION

Drug Treatment Courts (DTCs) have gained recognition as an alternative approach to traditional criminal

justice responses for individuals with substance use disorders. These specialized courts aim to address the

underlying issues of addiction while promoting rehabilitation and reducing recidivism. While the effectiveness of DTCs has been explored in various jurisdictions, limited research has examined their outcomes in the specific context of Western Canadian cities. This quantitative study aims to assess the post-sentencing and reoffense outcomes of a Drug Treatment Court in a Western Canadian city, shedding light on the effectiveness of the program and its impact on individuals with substance use disorders.

### METHOD

The study utilized a quantitative research design to assess the post-sentencing and reoffense outcomes of participants in a Drug Treatment Court program. Data were collected from both the DTC program participants and a matched comparison group of individuals who underwent the regular criminal justice process. The data collection process involved multiple stages.

First, a sample of individuals who had completed or were currently enrolled in the DTC program was selected. Their demographic information, criminal history, and substance use patterns were collected through structured interviews and a review of court records. Additionally, data on treatment engagement, such as attendance, compliance, and completion rates, were obtained.

To create a comparison group, individuals with similar demographic characteristics and criminal history were selected from the regular criminal justice process. Their data were collected using the same measures employed for the DTC participants.

Quantitative data analysis was conducted to compare the outcomes between the DTC participants and the comparison group. Outcome measures included

recidivism rates, defined as the occurrence of subsequent criminal offenses, substance use patterns, treatment completion rates, and social reintegration outcomes. Statistical analyses, such as chi-square tests, t-tests, or logistic regression, were employed to examine differences between the DTC group and the comparison group on these outcome measures.

Ethical considerations were adhered to throughout the study, including obtaining informed consent from participants, ensuring confidentiality, and following ethical guidelines for research involving human subjects. The study received approval from the relevant ethics committee.

The quantitative analysis of post-sentencing and reoffense outcomes within the Drug Treatment Court in the Western Canadian city offers valuable insights into the effectiveness of the program in reducing recidivism, improving treatment engagement, and facilitating successful community reintegration for individuals with substance use disorders. The findings from this study contribute to the existing knowledge base on the outcomes of Drug Treatment Courts in Western Canadian cities and inform future policy and practice considerations in the field of substance use disorder treatment and criminal justice.

### RESULTS

The quantitative analysis of post-sentencing and reoffense outcomes in the Drug Treatment Court (DTC) program revealed several key findings. The recidivism rates of participants in the DTC program were significantly lower compared to the matched comparison group who went through the regular criminal justice process. The DTC participants demonstrated a higher rate of treatment completion and showed more positive substance use patterns compared to the comparison group. Furthermore,

participants in the DTC program exhibited improved social reintegration outcomes, such as increased employment rates and stable housing arrangements.

### DISCUSSION

The findings of this study provide empirical evidence supporting the effectiveness of the Drug Treatment Court in the Western Canadian city in reducing recidivism and improving post-sentencing outcomes for individuals with substance use disorders. The lower recidivism rates among DTC participants highlight the positive impact of the program in addressing the underlying issues of addiction and promoting rehabilitation. The higher treatment completion rates and positive substance use patterns further suggest that the DTC program facilitates access to comprehensive treatment services and supports long-term recovery.

The improved social reintegration outcomes among DTC participants, such as increased employment rates and stable housing arrangements, indicate the potential of the program to address broader social determinants of criminal behavior and promote successful community reintegration. These outcomes are crucial for reducing the cycle of criminal involvement and supporting individuals in leading productive and law-abiding lives.

The findings align with previous research on the effectiveness of Drug Treatment Courts in other jurisdictions and provide valuable insights specific to the Western Canadian context. The results underscore the importance of implementing evidence-based practices that integrate substance use treatment with the criminal justice system to address the complex needs of individuals with substance use disorders.

### CONCLUSION

This quantitative study contributes to the understanding of post-sentencing and reoffense outcomes in a Drug Treatment Court in a Western Canadian city. The findings demonstrate the positive impact of the program in reducing recidivism, improving treatment engagement, and facilitating successful social reintegration among individuals with substance use disorders. The results support the effectiveness of the Drug Treatment Court model as an alternative approach to traditional criminal justice responses for this population.

The implications of these findings are significant for policy and practice considerations in the field of substance use disorder treatment and criminal justice. The evidence presented in this study supports the expansion and continued support for Drug Treatment Courts in Western Canadian cities, emphasizing the need for collaborative efforts between justice agencies, treatment providers, and community organizations.

Future research should focus on exploring the specific mechanisms and processes that contribute to the positive outcomes observed in the Drug Treatment Court program. Additionally, long-term follow-up studies are needed to assess the sustainability of the program's effects and examine factors that influence long-term recovery and reduced recidivism rates. Such research efforts will further contribute to evidence-based practices and inform policy decisions aimed at improving outcomes for individuals with substance use disorders involved in the criminal justice system.

### REFERENCES

1. Allard, Patricia, Tara Lyons, and Richard Elliott. 2011. Impaired Judgment: Assessing the



- Appropriateness of Drug Treatment Courts as a Response to Drug Use in Canada. Toronto, ON: Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network. [http://bibliobase.sermais.pt:8008/BiblioNET/upload/PDF2/01680\\_downloadFile.pdf](http://bibliobase.sermais.pt:8008/BiblioNET/upload/PDF2/01680_downloadFile.pdf) Google Scholar
2. Andrews, Donald A., James Bonta, and J. Steven Wormith. 2004. LS/CMI: The Level of Service/Case Management Inventory. Toronto, ON: Multi-Health Systems. Google Scholar
  3. Andrews, Donald A., Lina Guzzo, Peter Raynor, Robert C. Rowe, L. Jill Rettinger, Albert Brews, and J. Steven Wormith. 2012. Are the major risk/need factors predictive of both female and male reoffending? A test with the eight domains of the level of service/case management inventory. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 56(1): 113–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624x10395716>. Medline:21320860 Google Scholar
  4. Apel, Robert J., and Gary Sweeten. 2010. Propensity score matching in criminology and criminal justice. In *Handbook of Quantitative Criminology*, ed. Alex R. Piquero and David Weisburd, 543–62. New York, NY: Springer. Google Scholar
  5. Belenko, Steven R., Nicholas Patapis, and Michael T. French. 2005. The Economic Benefits of Drug Treatment: A Critical Review of the Evidence for Policy Makers. <https://www.slideshare.net/NicholasPatapisPsyDM/economicbenefitsofdrugtrx0205>. Google Scholar
  6. Bhati, Avinash S., John Roman, and Aaron Chalfin. 2008. To Treat or Not to Treat: Evidence on the Prospects of Expanding Treatment to Drug-Involved Offenders. Washington, DC: Urban Institute, Justice Policy Center. Google Scholar
  7. Dehejia, Rajeev H., and Sadek Wahba. 2002. Propensity score-matching methods for nonexperimental causal studies. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 84(1): 151–61. <https://doi.org/10.1162/003465302317331982> Google Scholar
  8. Deschenes, Elizabeth P., Susan Turner, and Peter W. Greenwood. 1995. Drug court or probation?: An experimental evaluation of Maricopa county's drug court. *The Justice System Journal* 18(1): 55–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23277556.1995.10871222> Google Scholar
  9. Festinger, David S., and Patricia A. Lee. 2004. Judge is a key component of drug court. *Drug Court Review* 4(2): 1–34. Google Scholar
  10. Fischer, Benedict. 2003. "Doing good with a vengeance": A critical assessment of the practices, effects and implications of drug treatment courts in North America. *Criminal Justice* 3(3): 227–48. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14668025030033001> Google Scholar
  11. Gibbs, Benjamin R., Robert Lytle, and William Wakefield. 2018. Outcome effects on recidivism among drug court participants. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 20(10): 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854818800528> Google Scholar
  12. Goldberg, Susan. 2011. *Problem-Solving in Canada's Courtrooms: A Guide to Therapeutic Justice*. Ottawa, ON: National Judicial Institute. Google Scholar
  13. Gutierrez, Lina, and Guy Bourgon. 2012. Drug treatment courts: A quantitative review of study and treatment quality. *Justice Research and Policy* 14(2): 47–77. <https://doi.org/10.3818/jrp.14.2.2012.47> Google Scholar
  14. Healey, Joseph F. 2014. *Statistics: A Tool for Social Research*. Stamford, CT: Cengage Learning. Google Scholar

15. Iacus, Stefano M., Gary King, and Giuseppe Porro. 2011. Multivariate matching methods that are monotonic imbalance bounding. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 106(493): 345–61. <https://doi.org/10.1198/jasa.2011.tm09599> Google Scholar
16. Justice Canada. 2009. Drug Treatment Court Funding Program: Summative Evaluation. Ottawa, ON: Evaluation Division. Google Scholar
17. Justice Canada. 2018. Charter Statement – Bill C-75: An Act to Amend the Criminal Code, Youth Criminal Justice Act and Other Acts and to Make Consequential Amendments to Other ACTS. Ottawa, ON. <http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/csj-sjc/pl/charter-harte/c75.html> Google Scholar
18. Koetzle, Deborah, Shelley Johnson Listwan, Wendy P. Guastaferrro, and Kara Kobus. 2015. Treating high-risk offenders in the community: The potential of drug courts. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 59(5): 449–65. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624x13515635>. Medline:24363291 Google Scholar
19. Latimer, Jeff, Kelly Morton-Bourgon, and Jo-Anne Chrétien. 2006. A Meta-Analytic Examination of Drug Treatment Courts: Do They Reduce Recidivism? Ottawa, ON: Research and Statistics Division, Department of Justice. Google Scholar
20. 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 and Delinquency* 49(3): 389–411. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001128703049003003> Google Scholar