

Spring 5-16-2007

## **An Analysis of the Anticipated Efficacy of Providing Motivational Interviews to Multiple DUI Offenders in Order to Reduce DUI Recidivism in Sacramento County**

AnnMarie Boylan

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/capstones>



Part of the [Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons](#)

---

**Golden Gate University**

**San Francisco, California**

Duplicate copy.  
cover is not  
clean.

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE ANTICIPATED EFFICACY OF PROVIDING  
MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWS TO MULTIPLE DUI OFFENDERS IN ORDER  
TO REDUCE DUI RECIDIVISM IN SACRAMENTO COUNTY**

**By:**

**AnnMarie Boylan**

**EMPA 396 – Capstone Project**

**May 16, 2007**

**Spring II 2007**

**Professor: Dr. Joaquin Gonzalez**

LD  
2001  
.G43

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY  
GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY  
536 Mission Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105-2968

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	ABSTRACT	2
II.	INTRODUCTION	4
III.	LITERATURE REVIEW	10
IV.	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	17
V.	RESEARCH RESULTS AND FINDINGS	22
VI.	CONCLUSION AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS	30
VII.	AREAS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	34
	REFERENCES	37
	APPENDIX 1 – KEY INFORMANT SURVEY	

## ABSTRACT

Alcohol related deaths and injuries on our roadways continue to take a significant toll on society. Despite aggressive educational campaigns, stiff fines and jail time the incidence of DUI arrests or worse yet, DUI related accidents are on the rise. Sacramento County has the ominous distinction of having the highest rate of alcohol-involved accidents, injuries and deaths per capita in the State of California. (California Office of Traffic Safety, 2004)

In response to this problem, the Sacramento City Police Department and the Sacramento County's Sheriff's Department will be piloting a program called the Behavior and Driving Safety Study Program. Beginning in July 2007, when a multiple DUI offender is booked into the Main Jail (central booking facility for the County), he/she will be asked to voluntarily participate in a "Behavior and Driving Study". All offenders who agree to participate will be asked to complete a questionnaire that asks them to discuss their perceptions about drinking and its impact on their life. Participants will then be selected and placed into the control group where they will be sent back to their cell to await release or they will be placed in the test group where they will receive a thirty-minute motivational interview (intervention) conducted by a mental health professional employed by the jail psychiatric services program. The goal of these interviews (interventions) is to determine whether a motivational interview administered shortly after the second or subsequent DUI arrest decreases the likelihood of repeat DUI arrests within two years. (IRB UC Davis, 2007) For the purposes of my analysis, I will seek to determine through key informant interviews and a substantial literature review if

it is likely that the addition of a motivational interview will positively impact the behavior of multiple DUI offenders and, therefore, result in reduced DUI recidivism.

A key informant survey was conducted to determine the potential efficacy of the Driving and Safety Study Program as defined. Survey participants responses indicated that they anticipated that the pilot would have some impact on offender behavior; however, they also anticipated that the pilot would fall short of expectations due to their belief that the program should be linked to mandatory alcohol and drug treatment. The secondary data collected through a literature review suggested that motivational interviewing would be an effective component in motivating offenders to recognize and commit to changing their drinking behaviors, however, the studies also indicated that the strongest model was a program that combined external behavioral sanctions (fines, vehicle impound, arrest) with alcohol and drug treatment.

# **AN ANALYSIS OF THE ANTICIPATED EFFICACY OF PROVIDING MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWS TO MULTIPLE DUI OFFENDERS IN ORDER TO REDUCE DUI RECIDIVISM IN SACRAMENTO COUNTY**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The problem of alcohol-impaired driving and its consequences is not a new problem in the United States and the issue has been receiving significant attention for over twenty-five years.

“In the 1980’s and continuing into the early 1990’s, major decreases occurred in alcohol-impaired driving and its consequences. The contribution of alcohol to fatal crashes dropped by 35-40% during this period. Two primary reasons for the decline appear to be the emergence of citizen activist groups that mobilized public support and attention to the problem, and the proliferation of effective laws. Since about 1995 the alcohol-impaired driving problem has stabilized at a reduced but still quite high level.” (Williams, 2006, p 136)

In order to fully appreciate the impact of this issue on our communities Mothers Against Drunk Driving (M.A.D.D.) policy director, Brandy Anderson provided the following analogy at an event commemorating their twentieth anniversary as an organization. “Alcohol-related collisions still kill 43 people a day – the equivalent of two airplane crashes a week. If two jetliners were crashing every week – week after week – the public outcry would be deafening. This issue should not get any less attention, especially since it’s a completely preventable violent crime.” (Koch, 2000)

Sacramento County experienced decreases in the incidence and consequences of alcohol-impaired driving for many years but that trend started to change in 1998 and has continued to worsen over the years. In 2004, according to the Office of Traffic Safety, Sacramento County had #1,449 fatalities due to alcohol-impaired driving. This ranks 4<sup>th</sup>

statewide in number of deaths and 1<sup>st</sup> statewide in terms of deaths per capita. (California Office of Traffic Safety, 2004) To further illustrate the severity of this issue in Sacramento County, the number of DUI arrests per year is on average #7,300 with #1,300 of these offenders having a previous DUI conviction. (California Office of Traffic Safety, 2004) The number of injuries and fatalities in Sacramento County in which alcohol is involved is averaging #1,200 annually (#50 deaths and #1,150 injuries). (California Office of Traffic Safety, 2004)

#### **Behavior and Driving Safety Study:**

In response to this problem, the Sacramento County's criminal justice community and local healthcare providers will be partnering to pilot a program called the Behavior and Driving Safety Study. Trauma surgeon, Dr. Leon Owens who is the Medical Director for Sacramento's Mercy Hospitals, designed this pilot program. Dr. Owens developed this pilot program out of frustration of seeing the day-to-day consequences of alcohol-impaired driving and felt that something could be done to impact this problem. Dr. Owens stresses that the collisions caused by alcohol-impaired driving are not accidents and are completely preventable.

What this program seeks to do is create a "teachable moment" (Dr. L. Owens, personal communication, January 2005) by providing a thirty-minute motivational interview (intervention) from an on-staff mental health professional. A Motivational Interview (MI) is a non-confrontational, patient-centered discussion between a counselor and an at-risk individual during which the individual's motivation and confidence to change health-related behaviors is explored. (IRB U.C. Davis) In the case of MI related to alcohol use, the counselor typically begins by prompting an open-ended discussion of

the subject's good and bad perceptions of drinking, allowing the subject to discuss how alcohol use affects his or her life. (IRB U.C. Davis, 2007) Previous studies of MI in health care settings have shown that MI administered after a stressful event reduces the likelihood of repeat arrest for DUI. (IRB U.C. Davis, 2007) The purpose of this intervention would be that during this stressful event (incarceration) in their lives that they would be more open to evaluating their behavior in terms of their drinking and motivate the individual to take positive action. In addition, if requested by the participant, the mental health professional will provide community treatment information to the offender prior to release from custody.

The success of the Behavior and Driving Safety Study will be assessed in two ways. The first will look at the DUI recidivism of the MI participants for a period of two years subsequent to the intervention. As an additional method of determining the efficacy of the MI sessions, participating individuals will also be sent follow-up surveys at both the six month and one year intervals to determine if the participant has engaged in treatment and/or self-reports positive changes in terms of their perception of drinking and drinking/driving behaviors.

In order to increase the participation in this voluntary program, offenders who agree to participate in this pilot program will receive a twenty-dollar gift certificate upon their release from custody and an additional twenty-dollar gift certificate for each of the two subsequent surveys they complete and return. In addition, participants will receive a letter stating that the District Attorney has waived the use of any information obtained from this study and the information provided will be kept completely confidential.



### **Specific Challenges with Multiple DUI Offenders:**

The frequency of drinking and driving is extremely high, with estimates by the Office of Traffic Safety showing that the average offender has driven drunk on average #200 – 400 times prior to their initial arrest. (California Office of Traffic Safety, 2004) According to the California State Office of Traffic Safety, between 70 – 75% of all DUI offenders do not re-offend and the initial consequences of the arrest and sanctions were sufficient to change behavior. (2004) However, in 25 – 30% of the cases the DUI offender will re-offend multiple times. This is the target population of the pilot Behavior and Driving study program. This is a more difficult population, and therefore, success in terms of recidivism with this population would be more significant in terms of long-term policy initiatives and strategies.

### **Vehicular Sanctions Throughout the State of California:**

A special circumstance is occurring throughout the State of California that may enhance the efficacy of the Behavior and Driving Safety Study. Starting in January 1, 2006, the State legislature enacted a law (SB 207) that allows law enforcement officers to impound vehicles of people throughout the State of California who have been arrested for their second or subsequent DUI infraction upon arrest and maintain possession of their vehicle for an extended period. Senate Bill 207 allows law enforcement to impound a repeat DUI offender's vehicle for #5 – 15 days depending on the number of prior offenses. Prior to SB207 a DUI offender's car was impounded but was available for release the next day. This expanded impound authority was given to all law enforcement agencies including City police departments, County sheriff department's and the California Highway Patrol.

The reason this law was enacted was to limit the DUI arrestee's access to their vehicle, especially since they frequently drive despite the revocation of their license. The goal is to prevent dangerous driving by more directly restricting access of dangerous individuals to the mechanism of harm, their vehicle. This vehicle impoundment is thought to add an "additional stressful event" which will also hopefully serve to enhance the impact of the motivational interview.

**The Focus of This Research Project:**

Again, the issue this research project will be examining is the impact of the added component -- the thirty-minute motivational interview (intervention). The main assumption that will be examined is "Are motivational interviews provided in a jail setting effective in getting multiple DUI offenders to change their behavior and, therefore, reduce DUI recidivism. The following sub questions arise: (1) can repeat DUI offenders be motivated to change through the use of motivational interviewing? (2) What other types of controls or sanctions should be used to motivate this population, such as: internal behavioral (personal safety issues), external behavioral controls (legal and vehicular sanctions) and social controls (peer pressure, social unacceptability). Lastly, this study will strive to determine if a motivational interview is effective on its own or if other types of controls or sanctions can complement and, therefore, enhance the effectiveness of the motivational interview on the offender's behavior.

There is considerable debate on what types of programming have had long-term success with multiple DUI offenders and recently several research projects (these studies are discussed further in the literature review section) have indicated that criminal sanctions and punitive measures alone haven't been effective with this population.

Recent studies have pointed to the introduction of social supports (brief intervention component) coupled with the existing legal sanctions as an effective long-term strategy. The introduction of a motivational interview (intervention) component is only being piloted in Sacramento County and it is important to examine if this added resource and social support would have any measurable impact on reducing DUI recidivism in the multiple DUI offender population.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

In reviewing literature for this project there are a wealth of articles, dissertations and other research information on projects and theories as they relate to the issue of Driving Under the Influence and various attempts to reduce its prevalence in our society. The Behavior and Driving Safety Study being piloted by Sacramento County is based on a similar program developed and tested at the University of North Carolina. Given that alcohol involvement has been recognized to be a major risk factor and contributor for motor vehicle injuries, a team of trauma surgeons from the University of North Carolina decided to conduct a study on the impact of a brief thirty-minute intervention on the incidence of DUI arrest recidivism. To illustrate how serious the medical community takes this issue, in 2005 the National Committee on Trauma made it an essential requirement that level one trauma centers screen for alcohol disorders and have a mechanism for providing interventions to patients who screen positive. (Schermer and Moyers, 2005)

### **Motivation Interview Study in a Trauma Center:**

The hypothesis of their study was "injured patients receiving a brief intervention would have a lower risk of DUI arrest within three years of discharge than those receiving standard care." (Schermer and Moyers, 2005) The brief intervention was given based on a random sampling methodology and standard care was given otherwise. For this study, standard care was defined as providing the patient with a list of alcohol and drug counselors and treatment locations in the community. (Schermer and Moyers, 2005) For

this study, brief intervention was a thirty-minute discussion and would be performed by a trauma doctor or social worker in the hospital's emergency wing. (Schermer and Moyers, 2005)

After randomization, the brief intervention and standard care groups were similar in age, prior DUI arrests and alcohol screening score. (Schermer and Moyers, 2005) A total of #157 patients were asked to participate with #126 agreeing to the intervention. (Schermer and Moyers, 2005) Of the #126 participants, #62 received the intervention and #64 received standard care. (Schermer and Moyers, 2005) After monitoring results for the #126 participants, one in six (16.7%) of the patients receiving a brief intervention had a DUI re-offense during the three year period versus 21.9% of the patients who received standard care. (Schermer and Moyers, 2005)

There are a variety of differences between the University of North Carolina (UNC) study and the Sacramento pilot project. Most notably, the setting of the UNC provides the intervention in a hospital setting versus a jail setting. In addition, the UNC study controlled the study participants by age and gender and it did not eliminate first time offenders. The Sacramento County Behavior and Driving Safety Study will not control participation by age or gender and will not include first time offenders as statistics have shown that 70 – 75% of first time offenders do not re-offend after the first arrest. (California Office of Traffic Safety, 2004)

#### **Why MI? - The Role and Potential Impact of Motivational Interviewing:**

Motivational interviewing was developed as a brief intervention alternative to the common counseling approach, which utilized an aggressive and often confrontational style. (Ferguson, 1998) As described by Robert Ferguson,

“(MI) Its goal is to increase behavior change by heightening and resolving ambivalence regarding problem behaviors (such as excessive consumption of alcohol) and thereby increasing motivation to change behavior. The gentle confrontation inherent in MI could allow for poorly motivated (DUI) offenders to begin to explore their perception of the effect alcohol abuse is having on their lives. Optimally, this enhanced perception of problems will result in heightened ambivalence about the use of alcohol. MI then attempts to help the interviewee resolve this ambivalence without imposing a solution.” (Ferguson, 1998)

Motivational interviewing principles are based on the “Transtheoretical model of Change” which theorizes that behavior change proceeds through a series of ten main stages. (Ferguson, 1998) The use of motivational interviewing is designed to assist people in their movement through the initial two stages of change. The earliest stage is described as a state where one is not attending consciously to the problem. (Ferguson, 1998) The next stage is characterized as by a high level of ambivalence about the problem behavior. (Ferguson, 1998) “Motivational interviewing includes methods designed both to increase awareness that a problem exists and also to increase the interviewee’s intention to change the behavior.” (Ferguson, 1998) In the Sacramento County Behavior and Driving Safety Study the use of motivational interviewing is hoping to assist offenders in the first two steps of self re-evaluation and self liberation which would impact how they feel about their drinking behavior and its impact on their lives. This technique also is designed to encourage them to make a commitment to change their drinking behavior and, therefore, change their drinking and driving behaviors.

### **The Ten Transtheoretical Processes of Change**

<b>Process of Change</b>	<b>Description</b>
Consciousness Raising	Increasing information about self and problem
Self Re-Evaluation	Assessing how one feels and thinks with respect to a problem
Self Liberation	Choosing and commitment to act or belief in ability to change
Counter-conditioning	Substituting alternatives for problem behaviors
Stimulus Control	Avoiding or countering stimuli that elicit problem behaviors
Reinforcement Management	Rewarding one's self or being rewarded by other for making changes
Helping Relationships	Being open and trusting about problems with someone who cares
Dramatic Relief	Experiencing and expressing feelings about one's problems and solutions
Environmental Reevaluations	Assessing how one's problem affects others
Social Liberation	Increasing alternatives for non-problem behaviors available in society

In 1997, Robert Ferguson conducted a study of #176 multiple DUI offenders who were involved in a residential substance abuse treatment program and utilized motivational interview techniques to try and move offenders more quickly toward recognition of their drinking behaviors and becoming committed to changing those behaviors. In his study, the use of MI was successful in moving offenders through the first two preliminary stages of change. It was also noted, however, that the most difficult offenders did not see the same results. It was determined that the use of MI had significant results with offenders within a moderate range of substance abuse, but results were not significant in offenders with significant substance abuse histories. (Ferguson, 1998)

### **Study of Types of Sanctions and Controls With Multiple DUI Offenders:**

While the University of North Carolina study was relevant to this research proposal due to the similarities in project design, an article published by the Journal of Studies on Alcohol in 2005 is relevant to this research proposal as the article discusses the findings of a longitudinal study conducted to explore what other types of interventions and sanctions (other than MI) have proven effective at reducing DUI recidivism. (Greenberg and Morral, 2005)

Mothers Against Drunk Driving (M.A.D.D.) funded a study to examine the correlations between drunk driving behavior and people's beliefs concerning the riskiness, social acceptability and morality of driving under the influence of alcohol. Repeated interviews were conducted with #182 multiple DUI offenders where initial baseline data was collected in three specific areas: "internal behavior controls which measure moral and prescriptive beliefs concerning alcohol impaired driving, external behavioral controls which measures perceived risks of criminal punishment and other legal sanctions associated with alcohol-impaired driving and social controls which measures perceived peer group attitudes toward alcohol-impaired driving." (Greenberg and Morral, 2005, p 640) The dependent variable for this study was "a measure of self reported alcohol-impaired driving over the preceding two year period, collected at the two year point following from baseline." (Greenberg and Morral, 2005, p 641) The results of the study showed that internal behavior controls (moral and prescriptive beliefs) were the most protective in terms of reducing the rate of alcohol-impaired driving within the study group. The attitudes toward external behavioral controls (criminal punishment and crashes) were neutral and attitudes toward social controls (perceptions by peer group)



increased the risk of continued alcohol-impaired driving. (Greenberg and Morral, 2005)

Recommendations from this study indicated that future policy interventions to curtail drunk driving should incorporate messages indicating the moral implications of the decision to drive drunk as well as emphasize the legal sanctions and criminal consequences. (Greenberg and Morral, 2005)

### **The Limits to the Deterrence Theory:**

In an attempt to reduce the prevalence of drunk driving, law enforcement officials have utilized the deterrence theory to try and reduce the incidence of drunk driving. "Deterrence theory proposes that individuals will avoid offending behavior(s) if they fear perceived consequences of being apprehended for the act." (Freeman, 2006) Examples of the types of actions taken are sustained policing efforts, increased criminal sanctions as well as other countermeasures such as well-publicized media campaigns. This has had a significant impact, however, the initial gains made in lowering the rate of DUI offenses and resulting social consequences has stalled.

"Of particular concern for deterrence theory is the growing body of research that has reported a counterintuitive effect for legal penalties, as punishment for criminal activity appears to be positively associated with some offending behaviors. In the case of recidivist drunk drivers, a number of questions remain regarding how this group perceives legal sanctions and why they continue to drink and drive despite incurring increasingly severe penalties. It has been suggested that deterrence theory cannot adequately explain why sanctions appear to promote further offenses in some contexts, and thus there appears to be a need to look beyond punishment theories if a greater understanding of the link between sanctions and criminal activity is to be achieved." (Freeman, 2006)

Other studies point to the need to look at the need to marry other sanctions and factors with legal sanctions when trying to change the behavior of a multiple DUI offender. An example of this situation is demonstrated in the 1990 study conducted by

the Los Angeles Police Department which coupled culturally based education programs with the legal sanctions and found it was effective in reducing DUI recidivism in a sample of Hispanic male offenders. (Moran, 1994) In this study, the use of external behavioral (legal sanctions) and social components (social unacceptability) factors were utilized to impact DUI recidivism and it was found to be effective.

However, as evidence of the complexity of working with multiple DUI offenders, a study conducted in Los Angeles in 2005 with Hispanic males studied the impact of legal sanctions along with education regarding the social consequences of driving and drinking and was not nearly as effective. The researchers found that the more the offender linked their drinking with positive social benefits (perception of improved social performance, more desirable) the less successful the program was at impacting their beliefs regarding negative social consequences. (Schell, 2006)

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The hypothesis for this project is as follows: If a multiple DUI offender receives a thirty-minute motivational interview (intervention) conducted by a mental health provider while the offender is still incarcerated, then it is anticipated that the offender will be less likely to have a DUI re-offense within a two-year period following the intervention. In Research Methods, the independent variable is described as "the cause" (O'Sullivan, 2003). The dependent variable is "the outcome or the effect that occurs through the manipulation of the independent variable. (O'Sullivan, 2003) In this study, the independent variable will be the thirty-minute motivational interview (intervention). This variable will be introduced and the study will analyze the impact that it has on the dependent variable, which is the likelihood that the offender will have a DUI re-offense within a two-year period following the intervention.

The operational definitions for this study are as follows: The thirty-minute intervention is defined as a discussion of issues related to the offender's history with alcohol and behaviors regarding alcohol use. In addition the interview will discuss the impact of alcohol and alcohol related behaviors on the offender's life. These interviews will be conducted by a mental health professional in the jail prior to release from incarceration. A multiple DUI offender is defined as an individual who is currently arrested for violation of the driving under the influence (Vehicle Code Sections 23152 and 23152) and has one or more prior convictions for driving under the influence (Vehicle Code Sections 23140, 23152 and 23153). For the purposes of this study, a

mental health professional is a person currently holding a license/credential as a LCSW (Licensed Clinical Social Worker) or MSW (Master in Social Work) and is employed by the jail psychiatric services program. For the purposes of this study and due to the anticipatory nature of this study, the conclusions and recommendations made as a result of this effort are based on the results of both the primary and secondary data collection. Specific emphasis will be made to only draw conclusions when a strong and defensible correlation can be made between the data and the anticipated efficacy of the Behavior and Driving Safety Study.

This research project utilized two different types of research methods: key informant surveys and a literature review of studies comparable to the Behavior and Driving Safety Study will be analyzed to determine the likelihood of success with the Sacramento pilot project.

**Primary Data – Key Informant Surveys:**

Primary data was collected through key informant surveys, which were sent to #25 stakeholders that have extensive experience working with the multiple DUI offender population, and based on their role, impact the issue at various stages of the DUI adjudication process.

The following categories of stakeholders were sent key informant surveys:

- Law Enforcement – Line deputy or city officers (2)
- Law Enforcement – Tow Hearing Officer (1)
- Law Enforcement – Jail Commanders (2)
- Law Enforcement – Jail Operations Commanders (2)
- Law Enforcement – DUI/Diversion Program Policy Analysts (2)
- DUI Treatment – Jail Psyche Services Counselor (3)
- DUI Treatment – Drug and Alcohol Community Based Providers (3)
- DUI Treatment – Healthcare/Trauma Care Physician (1)
- DUI Treatment – Corrections Nurses (3)
- DUI Treatment – Alcohol and Drug Policy Analysts (4)

Court Processes – District Attorney Representative (1)  
Court Processes - Public Defender Representative (1)

The key informant survey was sent by email through the use of [www.surveymonkey.com](http://www.surveymonkey.com). (See Appendix 1) The survey began with a brief introductory message introducing the researcher and explaining the purpose and use of the survey results. The introductory information also included a brief summary of the Behavior and Driving Safety Study in order to familiarize each survey respondent with the key components of the program. This was also done to provide a common understanding of the program across the survey participants. The key informant survey was comprised of eight questions overall. The first two questions gauged the respondent's self-reported knowledge and experience with DUI issues. The remaining six questions assessed the survey participant's perception of the multiple DUI offender's capacity for change through motivational interview by asking the respondent's if they felt that offenders were in general more like to be remorseful and accepting of responsibility for their actions or defiant and avoiding responsibility. The survey questions were also designed to assess whether the application of internal behavior controls (moral and prescriptive beliefs), external behavior controls (criminal punishment and injury) or social controls (peer group attitudes, societal disapproval) were felt by the group to be the most effective in changing behavior in this population. (Greenberg and Morral, 2005)

A pre-test survey was sent out to three individuals representing each of the three respondent areas: law enforcement, treatment provider and court process. Based on the feedback from the pre-test, the survey was re-formatted to utilize the Likert Scaling (O'Sullivan, 2003) to aid in data collection and comparison. Also some of the questions

were changed to allow respondents to place a value on each component of the program versus choosing their top three components. This allowed the respondent to specifically address their value of each component individually and improved the overall composition of the results data.

**Secondary Data – Literature Review of Studies Similar to the Behavior and Driving Safety Study:**

The second area of analysis will be the comparison of other comparable studies to the Behavior and Driving Safety Study. For example, there are several studies that have utilized motivational interviews with a multiple DUI population, however, these interviews occurred in different settings and in conjunction with other treatment options. The various studies will be compared and contrasted against the Sacramento County Behavior and Driving Safety Study and the resulting strengths and weaknesses will be detailed. Data collected from this analysis will be utilized along with the key informant survey results to prepare recommendations that can be integrated into the upcoming Sacramento pilot.

**About the Author:**

The author of this research study has been an employee of the County of Sacramento for over fourteen years and has served as a budget and policy analyst in the County Executive's office for the last five years. During her tenure as a policy analyst, she has worked in the areas of health and human services and in recent years, law and justice. In January 2007, the author accepted the position of Chief of Correctional Health Services for the Sacramento Sheriff's Department where she directs a healthcare program

at two correctional facilities which house #4,400 inmates daily and operates utilizing a \$41 million annual budget.

## **RESEARCH RESULTS AND FINDINGS**

The fundamental goal of utilizing motivational interviewing (MI) in the Sacramento pilot is to motivate multiple DUI offenders to recognize the need to change their behavior and especially their drinking and driving behavior. In order to assess the anticipatory efficacy of this strategy a key informant survey was conducted. The survey was sent out to #25 key participants in the DUI legal and treatment process, with nine (9) participants from law enforcement, fourteen (14) treatment providers and two (2) court system representatives. Of the #25 surveys sent out, there were #19 respondents with nine (9) representing law enforcement, eight (8) treatment providers and two (2) court system representatives. The survey was brief with only eight questions.

The first two questions were designed to determine if the participant's surveyed were sufficiently knowledgeable to accurately assess the perspective and motivations of the multiple DUI offender population. Of the #19 respondents, on a scale of #1 being (little knowledge of DUI offender population) and #5 being (very knowledgeable), the respondents scored themselves on average a 4.2 in terms of their knowledge of this issue and the target population.

Since the Behavior and Driving Safety Study seeks to change an offender's behavior it is important to assess the typical offender's willingness and ability to change. Question #3 asked the survey participants to assess whether the DUI offender was (1) remorseful, (2) indifferent, (3) accepted responsibility, (4) denied responsibility, (5) motivated to change or (6) resistant to change. The top two answers were resistant to



change (2.92) and denied responsibility (2.75) for their behavior. This is an interesting assessment because, if it is accurate, it would indicate an inherent unwillingness of the offender's in this program to accept responsibility for their behavior and that it will be more difficult to motivate them to make necessary changes.

The next question sought to assess what types of sanctions or controls affected the DUI offenders most significantly. In the literature review, a previous study had assessed the impact of three types of sanctions and controls: external behavioral (fines, fees, incarceration), internal behavioral (loss of self-esteem, feeling out of control) and social controls (social scrutiny from employers, friends and family). In the previous study, both external behavioral and social controls showed to be effective with internal behavioral having no discernable impact. The survey participants agreed with the results of the previous study and rated three external behavioral controls as being most effective with the DUI offenders: (1) fines, fees, (2) loss of vehicle and (3) being arrested. They also rated social controls second in terms of impact with internal behavioral controls last.

Question #5 asked survey participants whether they felt that the Behavior and Driving Safety Study was going to be effective. They were asked to rate whether the pilot would have (1) no impact, (2) some impact or (3) significant impact. All survey respondents gave the pilot a moderate response of "some impact".

Questions #6 and #7 sought to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the program design. The first questions focused on the potential strengths of the program with #1 being the least important strength and #3 being the most important strength. The top three strengths of the program, according to the survey participants, were (1) vehicle impound, (2) motivational interview and (3) voluntary participation. It is interesting to

note that two of the three components are external behavioral sanctions/controls with the third being an internal behavioral control.

In assessing the potential weaknesses of the program the number one weakness was that participation in the program didn't impact the outcome of their DUI case. The next two weaknesses were no direct linkage to alcohol and drug treatment and no ongoing case management. In reviewing the responses of the various participants there was no difference in terms of the law enforcement versus treatment provider's responses, all respondents felt that drug treatment and case management were needed to make this pilot successful. In looking at weaknesses in the utilization of MI in other studies, it showed that MI was helpful in getting offenders to recognize their need to change, however, it did not translate into the offender taking action to seek treatment. (Knighton, 2002)

The final question asked survey participants what they would recommend to improve the efficacy of the pilot program. By a 2 to 1 margin, all respondents indicated that direct linkage to alcohol and drug treatment would be critical to improve the program. The rest of the options which included increased jail time, longer vehicle impounds drew between six to eight responses each.

In addition to the primary data collected through the key informant surveys, secondary data was also used to assess the potential efficacy of the Behavior and Driving Safety study. The studies discussed in this secondary data section review the findings of other studies utilizing motivational interviewing (MI), sometimes with a DUI offender population, and studies that assess the effectiveness of utilizing other sanctions and controls as an adjunct to the use of MI.

### **Studies Related To A DUI Recidivist's Ability To Change:**

A study conducted by James Freeman studied #132 recidivist offender's and assessed their readiness to change and identified them on the stages of change according to the Transtheoretical Model of Change (utilized by the Sacramento pilot). (Freeman, 2005) The participants of this study were primarily male, had been arrested with blood alcohol levels three times the legal limit and had on average three prior DUI arrests. (Freeman, 2005) Interviews were conducted at a local correctional center after a meeting with the offender's probation officer. Despite the considerable and recent sanction by law enforcement and legal authorities, the program participants reported that 2/3 of them were not willing to change their drinking behaviors. (Freeman, 2005) To demonstrate the offender's inconsistent thinking in terms of their behaviors, 84% of the participants were willing to change their drinking and driving behaviors yet 66% felt there was no need to change their drinking behaviors. (Freeman, 2005) Upon examining their placement on the model of change, the largest group (41.5%) was in the pre-contemplation stage for drinking behaviors and the action stage for drinking and driving. In looking at recidivism data for these DUI offenders, it was found that high scores for the consumption of dangerous levels of alcohol and a low willingness to change their drinking behaviors lead to additional DUI recidivism. (Freeman, 2005)

"A key finding from the research was that a considerable proportion of repeat offenders may be consuming harmful levels of alcohol when coming into contact with the judicial system and despite multiple convictions, are not motivated to change such behaviors. It may prove essential to focus on resolving the underlying issues that directly influence the behavior such as alcohol misuse and/or dependence, rather than solely relying on traditional punitive approaches. Taken together, the program of research highlighted that some repeat offenders will remain resistant to change, even after the application of sanctions, and there remains a need to

look beyond punishment-based interventions if the drinking and driving cycle is to be broken for this high risk population.” (Freeman, 2005)

The argument that the criminal justice system must look past punitive measures was supported by a study conducted that assessed the offender’s ability to make rational choices and, therefore, control their behavior due to the adverse impacts of punitive sanctions. The study conducted by Jiang Yu found that:

“While sanctions deter offenders from being involved in future drinking-driving offenses, alcohol addiction prevents individuals from making rational choices, and, thus, increases offenders’ chances of being involved in drinking driving regardless of the certain, severe, and swift punishments they had experienced. Results indicated that, individuals with more severe alcohol addiction problems had increased chances of committing multiple offenses regardless of the sanctions that they had experienced relative to those with less severe alcohol-related problems. Findings seemed to suggest that criminal justice sanctions alone might not obtain expected deterrent impacts on individuals with alcohol and other addiction problems.” (Yu, 2006)

Again, this study suggests that the willingness and ability of an offender to respond to a motivational interview or any other support may be limited due to the significance of the offender’s alcohol addiction.

#### **Studies Related To The Use Of Motivational Interviewing (MI):**

In a study conducted by Aaron Ashby Harris at the University of Maryland College Park, motivational interviewing was tested to determine if its application would assist multiple DUI offenders in engaging more effectively with their mandated alcohol and drug treatment programs. A brief MI intervention was randomly administered to 48 of the DUI offenders enrolling in an outpatient treatment program and data was collected at baseline and 3-month follow-up sessions. (Harris, 2006) The findings of this study were inconclusive as to the results of the use of MI; however, it did appear that the

utilization of MI was helpful in terms of enhancing the offender's willingness to actively engage in their treatment programs. (Harris, 2006)

Another study seeking to determine the impact of motivational interviewing in changing behavior was a study conducted by Rebecca Kreman at the University of Nebraska. Ms. Kreman utilized MI as part of a study to encourage participants to comply with a diet and exercise regimen. (Kreman, 2005) It was hoped that the use of motivational interviewing would enhance program compliance and ultimately results derived from diet and exercise. (Kreman, 2005) This study was felt to be analogous to the Sacramento Behavior and Driving Safety Study as participants in the Nebraska study had suffered significant punitive impacts of their lifestyle choices and had to acknowledge and accept the role that poor nutrition and lack of exercise has had on the quality of their lives. (Kreman, 2005)

The results of the study showed that MI had an impact, however, it was short-lived and efficacy declined swiftly over time. The study also showed that the study participants were disinclined to change their eating and exercise patterns as they derived pleasure from these activities despite the significant impacts on their health. (Kreman, 2005)

#### **Studies Related To The Use Of Other Sanctions/Controls:**

Given the serious impact of this issue on society, there is considerable interest in determining which sanctions work best to reduce drunk driving. A study conducted by David DeYoung examined the effectiveness of alcohol treatment, driver license actions and jail terms in reducing drunk-driving recidivism. (DeYoung, 1997) This study was quite comprehensive and studies all California drivers holding a California driver's

license who were convicted of DUI during 1990 and 1991. (DeYoung, 1997) A number of demographic, prior personal driving history, and surrogate traffic environment measure were collected. Data was also gathered on subsequent DUI reconvictions, and the number of days to first subsequent DUI reconviction. (DeYoung, 1997) The results of this study showed that at all levels of prior DUI convictions, combining alcohol treatment with either driver license restriction or suspension is associated with the lowest DUI recidivism rates. (DeYoung, 1997) "Based on this research, and the results of prior studies, it can be persuasively argued that combining license actions with alcohol treatment represents the most effective sanction combination for combating DUI recidivism."(DeYoung, 1997)

In terms of sanctions, a study was conducted with multiple DUI offenders in Multnomah County, Oregon, which established a progressive system of sanctions. The DUI Intensive Supervision Program (DISP) is an innovative program which is a collaborative effort among several government divisions and private agencies, and has several components that have been demonstrated to be effective in reducing DUI recidivism, including close supervision of offenders, extended judicial monitoring and involvement, emphasis on treatment, and the requirement of sobriety. (Lapham, 2006)

This comprehensive 3-year program requires intensive probation and close monitoring and built-in punishments and rewards. Participation is voluntary and the incentive for participation is reduced jail time. Offenders spend only 1 -3 days in jail as they begin the program. Refusing DISP can lead to 60 days or more in jail. To be eligible for the program offenders must have had a prior DUI arrest and have no arrests for violent crimes. There are five goals of the DISP which are: honesty regarding slips

in drinking, zero tolerance of alcohol and drug use, zero tolerance of driving while license is suspended, mandatory treatment and payment of monetary obligations.

(Lapham, 2006) In a comparison of #460 offenders in the DISP groups with #497 were not part of the test group the recidivism rates for the DISP participants were half of that of the control group. (Lapham,2006)

## **CONCLUSION AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS**

The purpose of this research study was to assess, on an anticipatory basis, if the initial assumptions utilized in the development of the Sacramento County Behavior and Driving Safety Study were correct and if it can be expected that this pilot will be effective in lower recidivism rates in the multiple DUI offender population.

The initial questions for this study were:

1. Are motivational interviews provided in the jail effective in getting multiple DUI offenders to change their behavior and, therefore, reduce DUI recidivism?
2. Is the use of motivational interviewing effective in motivating multiple DUI offenders to change their behaviors?
3. What types of sanctions or controls are effective with this population such as internal behavioral, external behavioral or social controls?
4. Is the use of motivational interviewing effective on its own or should other sanctions and controls be utilized to complement and enhance its effectiveness?

In response to question #1, are motivational interviews provided in the jail effective in getting multiple DUI offenders to change their behavior and, therefore, reduce DUI recidivism? According to the survey participants and the literature review the answer is probably not. The primary data collected from the survey participants emphasized that the multiple DUI offender population is quite resistant to change and those surveyed felt that while the program would have some impact the results would fall short due to the need to link the MI session with mandatory alcohol and drug treatment.

The secondary data supported this skepticism as the University of Maryland study utilized MI with multiple DUI offenders who were already engaged in treatment. The study was inconclusive in terms of the effect of MI on the offender's engagement in their



The third question asked what other types of sanctions are effective with this population such as internal behavioral, external behavioral or social controls? The survey respondent's felt that the combination of external behavioral controls (fines, fees, loss of vehicle and arrest) were the most effective of all types of sanctions and controls. They also indicated that the MI was an important component and should be linked with mandatory alcohol and drug treatment.

The secondary data pointed out that recognition of an offender's dependence on alcohol is important as the offender may be incapable of "rational choices" (Yu, 2006) and that linkage to treatment services is critical. The literature also illustrated the inverse relationship to increasing criminal sanctions and that this phenomenon suggests a more significant dependence on alcohol and a limited benefit of increasing these sanctions. (Freeman, 2005)

The final question asked if the use of motivational interviewing was effective on its own or should other sanctions and controls be utilized to compliment and enhance its effectiveness? The University of Maryland study tested MI to determine if its use would assist multiple DUI offenders in engagement in their mandated alcohol and drug treatment. The study was inconclusive in terms of the unique benefits of MI; however, it was received favorably by the offenders in the program. (Harris, 2006)

The survey respondents did not see the use of MI as sufficient to motivate an offender to change their behavior but felt it would be more effective when coupled with alcohol and drug treatment.

Based on the results of both the primary and secondary data collected and implementing the program as currently designed, it can be expected that the use of motivational interviewing is appropriate and will assist offenders in both recognizing and committing to change their behaviors. However, due to limitations identified in the current program design, it is recommended that the program make the following program changes:

1. A mandatory alcohol and drug treatment component should be linked to the delivery of the motivational interview as to enhance the impact of these interviews and engage the offender while highly motivated,
2. An additional incentive for offender participation and commitment to alcohol and drug treatment should be offered through the opportunity to mitigate their DUI charge based on a progression of treatment steps tied to completion of treatment components, clean driving record post arrest and victim restitution efforts.

In conclusion, the Sacramento Behavior and Driving Safety Study, while well intentioned, should not be expected to be as successful as the study in North Carolina from which it is based. Both the primary and secondary data suggests that intervention with the multiple DUI offender population is extremely difficult and work with this population will only be successful through a varied and comprehensive approach.

## AREAS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Dr. Grace Motyka eloquently describes the need for further research to determine how to impact the world of the multiple DUI offenders in the following passage:

"Intoxicated drivers contribute to one of the most significant social, economic, and interpersonal burdens of all time. Individuals who drink and drive constitute one of the nation's major safety problems on our roadways today. Even though drinking drivers represent the minority of the driving population, they account for a large percentage of the total number of alcohol-related motor vehicle accidents, injuries and traffic fatalities. Complicating the problem of driving under the influence of alcohol is that many Driving Under the Influence (DUI) arrests are individuals who are repeat offenders. Efforts to address the drinking-driver problem have included prevention, education, punishment, and treatment. Multiple DUI recidivates confound the task of rehabilitation because, for them as a group, current programming does not appear as successful as it is for other first-time offenders who are not rearrested for subsequent DUI. (Myers, 1998)

In Dr. Motyka's research project she studied #123 1<sup>st</sup> time and multiple DUI offenders utilizing the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (MMPI-2). (Myers, 1998) The purpose of this analysis was to use this sophisticated assessment tool to try and isolate specific personality factors that could be used to differentiate the 1<sup>st</sup> time offender from the multi-DUI offender. After having all the participants take the MMPI-2 she grouped them according to the result patterns identified by the instrument. Dr. Motyka then in two separate samples tried to identify either the first time offender or multiple DUI offender through the use of the result data. Dr. Motyka's result pattern was specific enough to correctly distinguish the first time offenders versus the multiple DUI offender 84% and 92% of the time. This is very important research as it can allow law enforcement and treatment provider to target specific offenders who are expected to re-

offend. In addition, the ability to recognize and isolate specific offender behaviors can also assist in the formulation of treatment options customized to the offender and, therefore, increase the likelihood of treatment success.

In many studies conducted with the multiple DUI offender population the incidence of significant substance abuse dependence has been well documented. A study conducted at the Fielding Graduate Institute utilized the Self-Administered Alcoholism Screening Test (SAAST) to assess a participants' likelihood of developing into an alcoholic. (Hadesman, 2003) The SAAST is a tool consisting of 37 questions that has shown to be effective in detecting people who are at risk of developing alcoholism. (Hadesman, 2003) The study was conducted on #128 participants who were repeat DUI offenders. While distinctions were found in participants in the areas of excitement seeking, rebellion and compliance, overall the tool was not found to be effective in determining with any certainty the offender who would persist in his/her substance abuse problems and, therefore, would be more likely to have another DUI offense. (Hadesman, 2003)

In yet another study designed to profile the specific characteristics of the repeat offender, a study was done with 98 court-referred or attorney-referred DUI offenders at two outpatient facilities in Denver. Forty six percent of the offenders were 1<sup>st</sup> time offenders and fifty-six percent were multiple DUI offenders. According to Karen Moreau, who conducted the study, "The purpose of the study was two-fold: (a) to investigate if the percentage of treatment-seeking driving under the influence (DUI) offenders with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) is higher than the percentage in the general population and (b) to investigate if a greater proportion of DUI

repeat offenders than DUI first-time offenders meet the diagnostic criteria for ADHD.” (Moreau, 1996) Participants in this study were asked to voluntarily participate by providing responses to three separate rating scales, which are widely used to diagnose ADHD. (Moreau, 1996) While the results are considered preliminary, the initial results are intriguing as they indicate that the percentage of the study population that met the criteria was 34.7% versus 7% for the general population. (Moreau, 1996)

## REFERENCES

- California Office of Traffic Safety (2004). *Annual Progress Report*. Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved July 27, 2006 from <http://www.ots.ca.gov/statistics/2004.pdf>
- DeYoung, David J. (Aug 1997). An evaluation of the effectiveness of alcohol treatment, driver license actions and jail terms in reducing drunk driving recidivism in California, *Addiction*, Vol 92, pgs 989-997. Retrieved April 8, 2007 from Proquest Database.
- Ferguson, Robert T. (July 1998) Motivational interviewing with less motivated driving under the influence of alcohol second offenders with an exploration of the processes related to change, (*Doctoral Dissertation – University of Wyoming*). Retrieved April 12, 2007 from Proquest Database.
- Freeman, James (April 2006) Deterrence, Defiance and Deviance: An Investigation into a Group of Recidivist Drink Driver's Self-Reported Offending Behaviours, *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, Vol 39, pgs 1 – 19. Retrieved April 12, 2007 from Proquest Database.
- Freeman, James (July 2005) Self-reported motivations to change and self-efficacy levels for a group of recidivist drink drivers, *Addictive Behaviors*, Vol 30, pg 1230. Retrieved April 8, 2007 from Proquest Database.
- Greenberg, M. and Morral, A (Sept 2005). Drunk Driving and DUI Recidivists' Attitudes and Beliefs: A Longitudinal Analysis. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*. Vol 66. Iss 5. p 640 – 641. Retrieved July 10, 2006 from Proquest Database.
- Hadesman Ph.D., Steven M. (Aug 2003) A comparative study of ego-state prevalence and personality traits of alcohol problematic and non-alcohol problematic repeat DUI offenders, (*Doctoral Dissertation – Fielding Graduate Institute*), 127 pages. Retrieved April 12, 2007 from Proquest Database.
- Harris, Aaron A. (2006) DUI: Treatment compliance, retention, and motivation for treatment, (*Doctoral Dissertation – University of Maryland College Park*), Retrieved April 12, 2007 from Proquest Database.
- Institutional Review Board - University of California, Davis (Jan 2007) Protection of Human Subjects – Declaration/Assurance of IRB Approval "Sacramento County Behavior and Driving Safety Study", *Institutional Review Board - University of California Davis*. Approved by University IRB Full Committee January 22, 2007.

- Knighton, Wendy K (2002) Effectiveness of an intervention program for DUI (driving under the influence) offenders, (*Doctoral Dissertation – Auburn University*), Retrieved April 12, 2007 from Proquest Database.
- Koch, Kathy (October 2000) The Debate over Drunk-Driving Laws: An Overview, *Congressional Quarterly Researcher*, Vol 10. Retrieved April 8, 2007 from Proquest Database.
- Kreman, Rebecca M. (April 2005) Achieving Behavioral Change with Motivational Interviewing, (*Doctoral Dissertation – University of Nebraska*), 177 pages. Retrieved April 12, 2007 from Proquest Database.
- Lapham, Sandra (2006) Impaired-driving recidivism among repeat offenders following an intensive court-based intervention, *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, Vol 38, pg 162-169. Retrieved April 12, 2007 from Proquest Database.
- Moran, Julio (Sept 1994) Drunk driving arrests continue to decline in California law enforcement: Cases involving Latinos also drop. A Spanish-language education program is credited, *Los Angeles Times*, pg 19. Retrieved April 8, 2007 from Proquest Database.
- Moreau, Ph.D., Karen R. (1996) The prevalence of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder among treatment-seeking driving-under-the-influence first-time and repeat offenders, (*Doctoral Dissertation – University of Denver*), 119 pages. Retrieved April 12, 2007 from Proquest Database.
- Myers Ph.D., Rita W. (Jan 1998) MMPI-2 profile differences between first and multiple DUI offenders at a community-based correctional facility, (*Doctoral Dissertation – Kent State University*), 111 pages. Retrieved April 14, 2007 from Proquest Database.
- O'Sullivan, E., Rassel, G. and Berner, M. (2003) *Research Methods for Public Administration*. Fourth Edition. New York: Longman
- Owens, Dr. Leon, (January 2005) personal communication
- Schell, Terry L. (Mar 2006) Predicting DUI recidivism: Personality, attitudinal, and behavioral risk factors, *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, Vol 82, pgs 33 – 40. Retrieved April 8, 2007 from Proquest Database.
- Schermer, C. MD, MPH, Moyers, T. PhD, Miller W. PhD and Bloomfield, L. MSW, 2006, Trauma Center Brief Interventions for Alcohol Disorders Decrease Subsequent Driving Under the Influence Arrests, *The Journal of Trauma Injury, Infection and Critical Care*, Vol 60, p 29-34.

Williams, A. (2006). Alcohol-impaired driving and its consequences in the United States: The past 25 years. *Journal of Safety Research*. Vol 37. p 123-138. Retrieved July 10, 2006 from Proquest Database.

Yu, Jiang (Mar/Apr 2006) Alcohol addiction and perceived sanction risks: Deterring drinking drivers, *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol 34, pg 165. Retrieved April 8, 2007 from Proquest Database.



# Sacramento County Behavior and Driving Safety Study

## 1. Introduction and Program Overview

My name is AnnMarie Boylan and I am a graduate student with Golden Gate University. For my final project, I am analyzing the potential efficacy of providing brief 30 minute motivational interviews to multiple DUI offenders while they are still incarcerated in Sacramento County's Main Jail.

Sacramento County is preparing to launch a pilot program this summer which will explore and document the impacts of providing these brief interviews to multiple DUI offenders in order reduce DUI recidivism.

As a side note, SB207 was passed Statewide which allows law enforcement to impound a multiple DUI offenders vehicle immediately upon arrest from #5 - #15 days. It is hoped that this additional vehicular sanction will also enhance the ability of the motivational interviews to impact offender behavior.

A program overview of the Behavior and Driving Safety Study is provided below in order to acquaint you with the pilot effort and to outline the various program components.

You are being asked to participate in this survey due to your experience working with DUI offenders. Your responses will be used to assess the potential strengths and weaknesses of the program based on your experience.

The survey is quite short and should take less than 10 minutes. Please be assured that your responses will be kept completely confidential.

Thank you!! AnnMarie Boylan

## Sacramento County Behavior and Driving Safety Study

The Sacramento County Behavior and Driving Safety Study will target DUI offenders who have had a previous DUI within the last ten years.

1. Initially an offender is arrested and booked into the County jail.
2. The offender will be incarcerated and once they are able will be asked if they will be willing to participate in the Behavior and Driving Safety Study. They will be told that their input will be kept confidential and that their decision will not impact how long they are held in custody.

3. All offenders who agree to participate will be asked to complete a questionnaire that asks them to discuss their perceptions about drinking and its impact on their life.
4. Participants will then be selected for the control group or the test group. Those selected for the control group will be thanked for their participation and returned to their cell.
5. Participants selected for the test group will receive a thirty-minute motivational interview conducted by an on-site mental health professional.
6. The goal of these interviews is to determine whether a motivational interview administered shortly after the second or subsequent DUI arrest decreases the likelihood of repeat DUI arrests within two years.

In order to encourage participation, all participants will receive a \$20 gift certificate for their initial participation and an additional \$20 if they complete and return questionnaires at the six month and one year intervals.

**Next >>**

## Sacramento County Behavior and Driving Safety Study

### 2. Survey Questions (#1 through #8)

#### 1. How would describe your experience working with DUI offenders?

No experience ☐ A little experience ☐ Some experience ☐ Above average experience ☐ Significant experience ☐

#### 2. Have you worked directly with multiple DUI offenders?

No experience ☐ A little experience ☐ Some experience ☐ Above average experience ☐ Significant experience ☐

#### 3. What is your general perception of how a multiple DUI offender perceives his/her DUI crime? (1 - lowest and 5 - highest)

	Not true	Somewhat true	True	Commonly True	Always True
Remorseful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Indifferent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Accepts Responsibility	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Denies Responsibility	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Motivated to Change	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Resistant to Change	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

#### 4. In your experience what about their DUI offense impacted them the most?

	No impact	Some impact	Avg Impact	Major Impact	Highest Impact	Other (please specify)
Being arrested (External behavioral)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Fines, fees (External behavioral)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Social scrutiny from family/friends (Social)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Loss of vehicle (External behavioral)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Social scrutiny by employer (Social)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Loss of self-esteem (internal behavioral)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Feeling out of control (internal behavioral)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

5. After reviewing the Sacramento County Behavior and Driving Safety Study program summary, do you expect it to be effective in reducing recidivism in multiple DUI offenders?

No, I anticipate no impact ☐ Yes, I anticipate some impact ☐ Yes, I anticipate significant impact ☐

6. In your opinion rate the strengths of each of the program's elements. (1 being lowest and 3 highest)

	One	Two	Three
Vehicle impound	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Incarceration	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Motivation interview in jail	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Voluntary participation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
\$20 participatory stipend	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7. In your opinion, what are the program's weaknesses? (1 is the lowest and 5 is the highest)

	One	Two	Three	Four	Five
Program is voluntary	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Program participation does not impact DUI case	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Vehicle impound	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Incarceration	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Counseling intervention in jail	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Linkage to alcohol and drug services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ongoing case management	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Program has no weaknesses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**8. In your opinion, what would you recommend to improve the efficacy of the program? (Choose three)**

<input type="checkbox"/> Increased jail time	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: 200px; height: 100px; margin: 0 auto;"> <p style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold; transform: rotate(180deg);">RECEIVED</p> </div>
<input type="checkbox"/> Longer impound of the vehicle	
<input type="checkbox"/> Stiffer sanctions for DUI offenders overall	
<input type="checkbox"/> Direct linkage to alcohol and drug treatment	
<input type="checkbox"/> Participation in program lessens severity of DUI case	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)	

**Done >>**

**<< Prev**

**RECEIVED**

OCT - 1 2008

Golden Gate University, Univ. Library  
536 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94105