

Recovery Capital, Addiction Theory, and the Development of Recovery Communities^{*}

Rowdy Yates^a

University of Stirling

Abstract

An understanding of addiction as a complex disorder involving biological/physiological, psychological, sociocultural, and socioeconomic elements is well established as a foundation for good practice in treatment interventions. More recently, we have begun to view recovery from this disorder as being reliant upon a realignment of all these elements within the context of a sustained structure of encouragement and support rather than as an illness that will respond to a short, time-limited intervention such as treatment. Drug treatment-seeking populations have been rigorously researched, and we know much about their journey toward and through treatment and even into post treatment. However, nontreatment-seeking populations are far less well known, and we know almost nothing about their experiences of long-term recovery. What is known is that “natural” recovery from even the most serious episodes of addiction is widespread, perhaps even commonplace. In Europe, the majority of these natural recovery episodes appear to take place outside formal treatment and even in defiance of the injunctions and advice of treatment providers. Understanding this process of natural remission and the structures or elements that both make remission possible and sustain it over the long term will help to identify the most critical aspects of treatment interventions in general and after-care processes in particular. This chapter reviews the history of recovery movements, the implications of the accepted theories of addiction, and argues for the need to create communities of recovery in order to limit the intergenerational transmission of addiction.

Keywords: Recovery capital • Recovery movements • Addiction theory

* An earlier version of this paper was published as a book chapter. Yates, R. (2012). In it for the long haul: recovery capital, addiction theory and the inter-generational transmission of addictive behavior. In A. Adan & C. Vilanou (Eds.), *Substance abuse treatment generalities and specificities* (pp. 35–51). Barcelona: Marge-Medica Books.

a Corresponding:

Rowdy Yates, Scottish Addiction Studies, School of Applied Social Science, University of Stirling, Stirling, Scotland, United Kingdom, FK9 4LA

Research areas: Therapeutic communities and the self-help movement, drugs and popular culture, drug & alcohol policy, recovery communities and recovery champions

Email: p.r.yates@stir.ac.uk

In recent years, there appears to have been a growing interest both in a wider view of addiction and its treatment in general and of the issue of recovery in particular (Betty Ford Consensus Panel, 2007; HM Government, 2008; Scottish Government, 2008). In part, this rebirth of interest in recovery appears to have been driven by a media-led dissatisfaction with the perceived failures of the substitute-prescribing policy of the previous two decades (Ashton, 2007). In part also, though, it appears to owe much to a largely grassroots-led movement to redefine the nature and direction of the treatment process (Day, Gaston, Furlong, Murali, & Coppello, 2005).

This chapter briefly charts the early history of the recovery movement and outlines its beliefs. Most of these groups were self-help mutual-aid groups with little or no input from the mainstream treatment providers, who were largely content to leave the state response to excessive alcohol use to the relevant criminal justice systems (Berridge, 1999; Peele, 1995; Yates & Malloch, 2010; Yates & McIvor, 2003).

It was not until the middle of the 20th century that the scientific and academic community began to seriously explore the theoretical frameworks of addictive behavior. Prior to that time, there was a general acceptance of the broad position within the various temperance movements that the addictive element was firmly located within the substance: the Devil was in the bottle (Berridge, 1999; Peele, 1995; Roizen, 2004). With the development of competing theoretical models of addiction came the associated treatment, and though more gradually, changes in public perception and attitude (Roizen, 1987; Room, 2003). The history of addiction theory and its implications for treatment are outlined here and in the latter part of this chapter; the relevance of these two associated histories for the modern recovery movement and for the development of recovery communities is then set out.

The Early Recovery Movement

Some of the earliest examples of self-help mutual-aid fellowships appeared among the Native American population (White, 2000). Both Kenekuk, the so-called Kickapoo prophet and Handsome Lake, a Seneca chief,¹ founded popular

1 The Seneca people were one of the six tribes that constituted the Iroquois Nation

movements in the 18th century (White, 2000), built around the concept of recovery and sobriety, but extending across much of the cultural life of their tribe (Herring, 1877; Parker, 2008; White & Whitters, 2005). Both Kenekuk and Handsome Lake were reformed drinkers. Both saw sobriety as a first step in restoring cultural integrity and “upright living” to a people humiliated and disenfranchised by decades of white aggression and deceit.

Handsome Lake did much to restore the broken Iroquois Nation and rebuild the confederation as a respected force in Native American politics. His *Gaiwiio* (Good Message) runs to many pages and was (and still is) learnt by heart by many of his followers (Sturtevant & Trigger, 1978).

Both of these early movements, coming over 150 years before the establishment of Alcoholics Anonymous, (AA) recognized that simply stopping drinking was only a small part of the solution. What was required was a significant change in belief and behavior. Kenekuk railed against the high prevalence of domestic violence among the Kickapoo and Handsome Lake argued that the work of a sober Indian was to organize and restore the dignity and cultural self-belief of the red man (Parker, 2008; Smith, 1985; White, 2000).

Similarly, the Washingtonian movement, which flourished across America in the mid-19th century, argued that a reformed drunkard had a crucial duty to become the family’s main breadwinner. The Washingtonians (more formally entitled the “Washington Temperance Society”); a recovery movement founded in 1840 by a group of former drinkers, eschewed religious doctrine and allowed only “reformed drunkards” to speak at their meetings (Maxwell, 1950; Peele, 1995). The Washingtonian meetings followed a format remarkably similar to that adopted by the Alcoholics Anonymous fellowship almost 100 years later. T. S. Arthur (1848; 1992), in a temperance tract published some eight years after their formation, paints a vivid picture of his attendance at Washingtonian meetings in Philadelphia and offers a series of somewhat romanticized vignettes of the lives and tribulations of some of its members. Even within this short space of time, the Washingtonians were holding regular meetings in most East-coast cities in America and had already established a number of lodging houses for the respite of their fallen members. On the anniversary of the 110th anniversary of the birth of George Washington, Abraham Lincoln chose the meeting of the Springfield Washingtonians to deliver his memorial address

(Basler, 1953). At its peak, the Washingtonians numbered between 300,000 and 600,000 (reports vary wildly) and could boast at least 150,000 members in long-term recovery (Maxwell, 1950; Peele, 1995; White, 2001).

Although the organization allowed only those in recovery to speak at their meetings, both membership and attendance was open to all. As a result, membership appears to have been swelled by an influx of temperance campaigners and religious proselytizers. This resulted in a series of damaging, and ultimately fatal, internal schisms, with some members insisting that the organization be more active in the prohibition campaign, more meaningfully connected to the established church, and even, more active in the antislavery movement. For some 20 years, the Washingtonians flourished, founding new branches across America, but by the 1860s, the internal feuds caused the organization to implode. Some of its sober houses continued, often under the management of other temperance organizations; the sober house in Chicago became the Washington Hospital and continued to offer alcohol treatment up until the 1980s. But mostly, the organization simply crumbled. Members left to join other related organizations, and by the 1940s, the dissolution was so complete that the founders of Alcoholics Anonymous claimed never to have heard of it (Peele, 1995).

In the early years of the 20th century, the Emmanuel Movement, based in the Emmanuel Baptist Church in Boston, began to achieve significant attention for their blend of spirituality, medicine, and a kind of basic psychotherapy. The movement attracted serious criticism from Freud during his brief visit to the United States in 1909. Freud was, perhaps, understandably, particularly scathing about the limited medical qualifications of the movement's main protagonists (Dubiel, 2004). Despite Freud's skepticism and that of many other medical professionals, the movement grew, and in 1909, Ernest Jacoby began to organize weekly meetings at Emmanuel Baptist Church. More meetings began to be established as Jacoby Clubs ("A Club for Men to Help Themselves by Helping Others"), and Jacoby Clubs and their weekly meetings flourished (McCarthy, 1984). In Boston, the Jacoby Club provided meeting space for one of the earliest AA groups, but the two organizations remained separate and the Jacoby Clubs gradually lost out to their newer, more vigorous fellow traveler (Dubiel, 2004; White, 2000).

What seems striking about these early recovery groups is the similarity of their insistence that stopping drinking alone was not enough to sustain recovery. What was required was a much more radical alteration in the former addict's thinking about themselves and how they behaved toward others and the company they kept. In this, they foreshadowed the central tenets of the Black Power movement—similarly led by a reformed criminal and multidrug user, Malcolm X—in the 1960s (White & Whitters, 2005). Malcolm X argued that stopping the usage of drugs and drinking and stopping offending was not enough. Members of the movement were exhorted to be “black and proud” (Johnson, 1986).

The Alcoholics Anonymous fellowship has been one of the most successful mutual aid groups and has spawned a number of parallel organizations, including Narcotics Anonymous, Gamblers Anonymous, and Cocaine Anonymous. They too have, from their earliest writings, discussed the concept of the “dry drunk”: the former drinker who continues to behave in ways that are unacceptable and that were the hallmark of their former drinking career (Mäkelä, 1996).

Largely informed by the work of therapeutic community (TC) pioneer, Charles Dederich, at the experimental commune, Synanon, and bolstered by the “second generation of therapeutic communities on the East coast of America” (Broekaert, Vandervelde, Soyez, Yates, & Slater, 2006; Rawlings & Yates, 2001), the residential self-help community, modeled on AA practices, rapidly gained a foothold in Europe in the early 1970s. In Europe, this development was melded with the existing therapeutic community practice in psychiatry pioneered by Jones, Laing, Clark, and others and grafted onto a century-long tradition of caring for (and addressing the needs of) “maladjusted” children (Rawlings & Yates, 2001). Even with this rich history, however, the notion that a community of addicts could manage and control the elements of their own recovery, was initially greeted with skepticism within mainstream addiction treatment (Broekaert et al., 2006; Yates, 2003).

Perhaps one of the most telling clues to the origins of the TC movement lay in its insistence on the AA concept of the “dry drunk.” Early in the history of Synanon, Dederich argued that Synanon was emphatically not a treatment service; rather, he said, it was a school where people learned to “live right..” Subsequently, De Leon, one of the foremost evaluators of the TC, and

undoubtedly its foremost chronicler, argued that the notion of “right living” lay at the heart of the TC approach (De Leon, 2000). The TC, he suggested, was more school than hospital and could better be viewed as a learning environment where individuals learned (or relearned) correct behavior. Abstinence was not a goal, necessarily, rather a serendipitous outcome of overall behavior change.

Addiction Theory

Peele (1995) has noted that the vigorous promotion of alcoholism as a chronic, relapsing disease by the scientific medical community in the 1950s and 1960s (Glatt, 1952; Jellinek, 1952, 1960; Keller, 1962) has effectively embedded the notion of addiction—in both the public consciousness and (to a lesser, though significant extent) within the academic discourse—as an incurable condition that can, at best, be managed and contained. Room (1983) has charted the opposition to this position by sociological researchers and proponents of the behaviorist schools, but, although these arguments gained significant ground during the 1970s and early 1980s, the increasing focus, during the past two decades, upon infection control and crime reduction has resulted in a general return to a medical model of addiction treatment, predicated upon the management of the problem and containment of its physiological and criminological sequelae.

The notion of a disease, which robs those afflicted with it, of their individual will, is embedded in a cultural context where individuality and liberty is a paramount aspiration and where appropriate behavior is an individual personal responsibility. This, of course, is precisely the cultural matrix that developed with the industrialization of previously rural communities, where controls had tended to be vested more explicitly within the family or “tribe” than in the individual.

These concepts have proved to be of an enduring nature. The current definition of addiction or dependence, as set out in the *International Classification of Diseases* (ICD-10) (World Health Organisation, 1992), neatly sets out this diagnostic requirement as “Impaired capacity to control substance-taking behavior in terms of onset, termination or level of use.” ICD-10 lists a number of other manifestations of addiction,² including a preoccupation with the substance of choice, which disregards other important concerns or alternatives. Room (2003)

2 The WHO uses the term “dependence” – currently, the preferred terminology.

argues that this definition, again, is culturally specific, relating to a social structure in which time has become a commodity in itself, “a cultural frame in which time is... used or spent rather than simply experienced” (Room, 2003, p. 226).

Thus, the discovery of addiction (and, consequently, of “recovery”) came during a period of extraordinary social upheaval and change. In America, in particular, the period was also associated with additional changes in established communities as existing residents moved out to explore and settle new territories and were replaced by significant numbers of immigrants from Europe. In the period between 1785 and 1835, the population of the United States almost doubled (Peele, 1995). In the newly settled territories, drinking houses were largely rudimentary, frequented by prostitutes and gamblers, and generally structured to encourage drunkenness and heavy, drink-related spending—a far cry from the community-oriented taverns in the close-knit communities most settlers had left behind. In the cities and established communities, the new immigrants brought with them European drinking practices, which were often frowned upon and largely misunderstood.

The publication of Jellinek’s 1952 work on phases of alcoholism, and its subsequent incorporation into World Health Organisation guidelines (Room, 1983), significantly influenced discussions on the nature of addiction and recovery for most of the 1950s and 1960s. This disease model of addiction was not without its critics. Trice and Wahl (1958) tested Jellinek’s hypothesis and concluded, “If the concept of a disease process in alcoholism is valid, only the earliest or the most advanced stages are reliably indicated.” Similarly, the presentation of alcoholism as an *irreversible* disease has been subjected to much debate and criticism.

Davies (1962) provided an early challenge to this notion with a paper in the *Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, which noted the capacity of many of his patients to return to normal drinking patterns. Commentaries in subsequent issues—on both his findings and his diagnostic methodology—were heated but largely scholarly. Not so the response to the Rand Report, *Alcoholism and Treatment* (Armor, Polich, & Stambul, 1976). The controversy that surrounded the publication of this report, with its finding that not only was a reversion to controlled drinking possible, but that it was the most likely successful outcome, sparked a public argument, which refused to die down. Room (1983) has noted

that some studies of controlled drinking had their funding withdrawn at this time and that the debate became, at times, extremely emotive. The authors were accused of providing struggling abstainers with a “scientific excuse for drinking” (Room, 1983) and numerous commentators predicted dire consequences as a result of its publication (Roizen, 1987). However, as Roizen points out, subsequent studies (Hingson, Scotch, & Goldman, 1977) indicated that this apprehension had been misplaced and the publication of the report—and its interpretation in the media—had had little or no impact on drinking behavior.

By this time, the notion of addiction as a disease was being increasingly challenged, particularly by sociological and psychological theorists. As social concern switched from being largely dominated by alcohol misuse and began to respond to an increasing use of illicit drugs, particularly heroin and cocaine, the emergence of theories based upon psychodynamic, sociocultural and behaviorist traditions multiplied inexorably.

Khantzian (1974), Khantzian, Mack, and Schatzberg (1974), and Wurmser (1974) and others suggested that the origins of addiction might lie in deep-rooted childhood trauma. Psychoanalytic and psychodynamic theorists have been prominent in developing theories of drug dependence based on personality factors. Early psychoanalytic theories suggested that alcohol abuse reflected an individual who was experiencing severe conflict concerning dependence, which was expressed by oral fixation. Over the years, these theories have ranged from suggestions that drug dependence reflects low self-esteem to sex role conflicts, or feelings of powerlessness that mask a need for control (Blane & Leonard, 1987). According to Wurmser, addiction is the result of a “narcissistic crisis” that creates “neurotic conflict” (Wurmser, 1974, 1987). In this model, a harsh superego creates intense feelings of rage, fear, guilt, and anxiety. The use of drugs is a way of escaping these feelings.

Others (Ellis & Harper, 1975) proposed a behavioral origin to the addiction phenomenon, based largely upon the work of Skinner and Pavlov. Addiction was, they argued, a learned behavior that could, in turn, be unlearned or, perhaps more accurately, replaced with less self-destructive behaviors. These theories, in their turn, spawned a raft of cognitively-based interventions still in use today, including motivational interviewing (Miller & Rollnick, 1991) and relapse prevention (Marlatt & Gordon, 1985).

Perhaps the greatest leap forward in understanding addiction came with the work of theorists such as Engel (1980), Robbins (Robbins et al., 1970), and Zinberg (1984) through the development of models of addiction—most often described as biopsychosocial—which are multidimensional.

Biopsychosocial theories of addiction argue that the addiction experience is impacted upon by three distinct factors. These factors—Zinberg’s “drug, set and setting”—are the chemical interaction and any biological or genetic predisposition to intoxication; the individual’s psychological and spiritual state, and the environment in which he or she exists. This three-part model has been hugely influential in the drug treatment field in the past 30 years. Some practitioners have argued that the model provides an essential framework for assessment and treatment planning (Yates, 1985), and most validated instruments, such as the Maudsley Addiction Profile, the Addiction Severity Index, and the Client Treatment Matching Protocol, would appear to owe their genesis to this layered and individualistic approach to the problem.

Subsequently, a number of practitioner authors argued that the model was not only a tool for understanding addiction, but could also be used to assess problems and plan treatment interventions. Yates (1979, 1984) developed an assessment model that set out the various questions that would need to be asked to ascertain the balance of difficulties experienced by the individual in each of the three domains. Thus, if the level of drug-taking was relatively low and of short duration while self-esteem and the availability of non-using friends and relatives was correspondingly high, then a fairly low intensity intervention would be required. Madden (1977) similarly argued that the three domains outlined by Zinberg could be used in an understanding of the “treatment strengths” with which the addict came to their first appointment.

Addiction Theory and Long-Term Recovery

Addiction theory matters not simply because it underpins the approaches used in drug treatment interventions,³ but because it also has implications for recovery and for the long-term sustainment of recovery (Goode, 2007).

If indeed addiction is a result of a fluid interaction between the biological propensity, the environmental setting, and the self-esteem and self-belief of the individual, then clearly, an intervention must address all three elements if it is to be successful. Treatment interventions, which are limited to a concentration on the addict's consumption of substances, will, at best, deliver a level of stability. At the worst, they will attempt abstinence for which the individual will—without radical changes to his/her environment and their own self-esteem—be both ill-prepared and ill-equipped.

The term “social capital” is generally used by sociologists to describe the connections within and between social networks. The term was probably first used by the American schools inspector, Lyda Hanifan. Introducing the term in a 1916 report on rural schools in Virginia, Hanifan explained:

“I do not refer to real estate, or to personal property or to cold cash, but rather to that in life which tends to make these tangible substances count for most in the daily lives of people, namely, goodwill, fellowship, mutual sympathy and social intercourse among a group of individuals and families who make up a social unit...” (Hanifan, 1916, p. 130).

Sheldon and MacDonald (2009) note that Hanifan's notion of “social capital” was rooted in a belief in self-help and peer support. Hanifan himself was content to conclude that: “It was not what they [professionals] did for the people that counts in what was achieved; it was what they led the people to do for themselves that was really important” (Hanifan, 1916, p. 138). Whatever its origins, it is clear that the term has become a shorthand for all that is good about community spirit in the related fields of sociology, social policy, and social work. Significantly, Hanifan maintained that social capital, unlike other forms of capital, was not depleted with use. On the contrary, its use resulted in an

³ At least, this should be the case. Paradoxically, it can be argued that many substitute prescribing agencies, while espousing a biopsychosocial approach, actually operate as if their central principle was the disease model. Equally, 12-step fellowships, despite arguing for the disease model, in practice place as much, or more, emphasis on securing changes in personal self-perception and the sociocultural environment.

increase—a phenomenon that Hanifan described with the pithy slogan, “use it or lose it” (Hanifan, 1916, p. 139): a concept not a million miles from the therapeutic community principle, “you can’t keep it unless you give it away” (De Leon, 2000; Rawlings & Yates, 2001), a slogan designed to describe the personal benefit that those in recovery receive by helping others with their own recovery.

More recently, writers on recovery, such as White and Cloud (2008), and Best and Laudet (2010), have taken this idea and coined the term “recovery capital” to describe changes they have observed in the resilience and robustness of people’s social and emotional circumstances in long-term, abstinent recovery. There are, they argue, dramatic improvements in self-esteem, civic and social engagement, physical and psychological health, and overall well-being. These changes, they argue, are fundamental to the successful outcome of any abstinence-based recovery journey (Best et al., 2010).

“The best predictor of the likelihood of sustained recovery is the extent of ‘recovery capital’ or the personal and psychological resources a person has, the social supports that are available to them and the basic foundations of life quality, i.e., a safe place to live, meaningful activities and a role in their community (however this is defined).” (Best et al., 2010, p. 8).

Cloud and Granfield (2009) have recently suggested that this concept can be further refined as four individual, though overlapping, categories: social, physical, human, and cultural. Best and Laudet (2010) endorse this view, but note that of these, the social, human, and cultural capital “reserves” are probably of the most significance, particularly in group or community settings:

“Although the focus here is primarily on individual factors, it is the meshing of three of these components—social, human and cultural capital—that may be particularly important in assessing recovery capital at a group or social level.” (Best & Laudet, 2010, p. 4).

But significantly, these categories bear a striking resemblance to Zinberg’s “drug, set and setting” (and to Madden’s “the seed, the soil and the atmosphere,” *op cit.*, and Yates’ “effect, expectation and situation,” *op cit.*). In all of these analyses, it is argued that changes in these three central areas are vital for both a comprehensive assessment and the development of a person-appropriate treatment plan. What was not examined in any systematic way in these earlier

writings was the use of this model to measure long-term improvements in individual resilience and social reintegration. What is argued here is that the use of the biopsychosocial model in all phases of the recovery journey would provide a coherence to the role of various interventions throughout the process and enable drug treatment practitioners—even those who remain skeptical of the so-called “recovery agenda”—to view their role in the process from within an accepted scientific framework.

Recovery Communities and the Way Forward

Drug and alcohol addiction is heavily stigmatized within most cultures (Singleton, 2011) and this stigma impacts upon former addicts in recovery, further problematizing their condition and making their recovery more, rather than less, difficult.

In some respects, the blame for this stigmatization can be laid at the door of the major treatment agencies. Many recovery-oriented services encourage drug users and their partners to be continually on their guard against relapse and constantly vigilant for signs of the imminent return of their disease. Similarly, many harm-reduction-oriented treatment services argue for continuing maintenance, prescribing so-called opioid replacement therapy. In practice, both groups are, in effect, encouraging a wider societal view of addiction as an incurable disease that can only be managed—either with continuing attendance at recovery meetings or with continued prescriptions for substitute drugs. Thus, a public view of relapse as an inevitable event for most, if not all, former addicts underpins many of the negative attitudes that are directed toward this group.

Clearly, the long-term solution is the creation of visible, recovery-friendly communities where the individuals’ recovery status is celebrated and seen as an asset for that community to use rather than a liability for it to prepare for. Such a change will inevitably involve encouraging those in recovery to be more active within their communities as recovery champions and advocates. It will also, however, demand changes in practice and outlook in treatment providers themselves.

Numerous authors (Best, Harris, & Strang, 2000; White, 2009; White & Whithers, 2005; Yates & Malloch, 2010) have commented upon the apparent antipathy,

even occasionally outright hostility, of mainstream treatment practitioners to the “unscientific” nature and ungrounded optimism of the self-help recovery movement (Best, Harris, & Strang, 2000; Yates & Malloch, 2010). In order for this skepticism to be modified, the recovery movement in all its forms (spiritual healing communities, 12-step groups, therapeutic communities, etc.) will need to demonstrate an openness to research and innovation and a willingness to debate their role and responsibility within the wider sphere.

Why this seems important is not only because of issues of individual well-being, but due to the wider issue of intergenerational transmission of addiction and its associated problems: low educational achievement, unemployment, offending behavior, teenage pregnancy, physical and mental ill-health. Numerous authors have noted this phenomenon (Best, Harris, & Strang, 2010; Gilman & Yates, 2011; Peele, 1985; Peele & Brodsky, 1975) and argued that improvement in this area is the ultimate prize for treatment intervention. While some have argued that this apparent inheritance of problematic behavior may have its roots in genetics (Goodwin, 1990), the argument for a mixture of the biological, social, and psychological (echoing the biopsychosocial model) seems particularly compelling. Since long-term, abstinence-oriented recovery appears to require significant improvements in all three domains, it seems appropriate to explore whether such recovery journeys have an impact upon parenting and subsequent behavior in drug-affected families.

Andreas and O’Farrell (2009) have noted improvements in behavior and attitude among the children of parents in long-term engagement with mutual-aid fellowships. Similarly, in a large Australian study, Callan and Jackson (1985) reported significantly better behavior and well-being of children in families where one or both parents had achieved long-term recovery than among children where parental drug use was continuing.

Conversely, numerous studies have shown that long-term substitute prescribing, concentrating as it does on the biological elements of the addiction experience—while having a significant impact upon illicit drug use and its consequent criminality and joblessness—seems largely unable to completely eradicate these behaviors in the majority of individuals (Best et al., 1998; Best et al., 1999; Best, Harris, Gossop et al., 2000; Best & Ridge, 2003). Illicit drug use and criminality appear to continue at a reduced level in most thus

prescribed cases (Eley, Malloch, McIvor, Yates, & Brown, 2002; Eley-Morris, Gallop, McIvor, Morgan, & Yates, 2002; McIvor et al., 2006; Yates, McIvor, Eley, Malloch, & Barnsdale, 2005).

Thus, while long-term substitute prescribing might seem to offer the greatest gains—in terms of treatment expenditure—over the short term, it would appear that long-term abstinence-oriented recovery is likely to deliver the most significant gains when examined over a more significant period.

References

- Andreas, J., & O'Farrell, T. (2009). Alcoholics anonymous attendance following 12- step treatment participation as a link between alcohol-dependent fathers' treatment involvement and their children's externalising problems. *Addiction, 36*, 87-100.
- Armor, D., Polich, J., & Stambul, H. (1976). *Alcoholism and treatment*. Santa Monica CA: Rand Corp. Publications (R 1739).
- Arthur, T. S.. (1992). *Temperance tales or six nights with the Washingtonians*. Philadelphia: W. A. Leary & Co.
- Ashton, M. (2007). The new abstentionists [Special Insert]. *Druglink*, December/January, 1-16.
- Basler, R. P. (Ed.) (1953). *The collected works of Abraham Lincoln*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Berridge, V. (1999). *Opium and the people: Opiate use and drug control policy in nineteenth and early twentieth century England*. London: Free Association Books.
- Best, D., & Laudet, A. B. (2010). *The Potential of recovery capital*. London: Royal Society for the Arts.
- Best, D., & Ridge, G. (2003). Using on top and the problems it brings: additional drug use by methadone treatment patients. In G. Tober & J. Strang (Eds.), *Methadone matters: Evolving community methadone treatment of opiate addiction* (pp. 141-154). London: Martin Dunitz.
- Best, D., Harris, J., & Strang, J. (2000). The NHS AA/NA: NHS attitudes to 12 step help. *Addiction Today, 11*, 17-19.
- Best, D., Harris, J., Gossop, M., Farrell, M., Finch, E., Noble, A., & Strang, J. (2000). Use of non-prescribed methadone and other illicit drugs during methadone maintenance treatment. *Drug and Alcohol Review, 19*, 9-16.
- Best, D., Lehmann, P., Gossop, M., Harris, J., Noble, A., & Strang, J. (1998). Eating too little, smoking and drinking too much: Wider lifestyle problems among methadone maintenance patients. *Addiction Research, 6*, 489-498.
- Best, D., Gossop, M., Stewart, D., Marsden, J., Lehmann, P., & Strang, J. (1999). Continued heroin use during methadone treatment: relationships between frequency of use and reasons reported for heroin use. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence, 53*, 191-195.

- Best, D., Rome, A., Hanning, K. A., White, W., Gossop, M., Taylor, A., & Perkins, A. (2010). *Research for recovery: A review of the drugs evidence base*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Betty Ford Institute Consensus Panel. (2007). What is recovery? A working definition from the Betty Ford Institute. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 33*, 221-228.
- Blanc, H. T., & Leonard, K. E. (Eds.). (1987). *Psychological theories of drinking and alcoholism*. New York: Guilford.
- Broekaert, E., Vandervelde, S., Soye, V., Yates, R., & Slater, A. (2006). The third generation of therapeutic communities: The early development of the TC for addiction in Europe. *European Addiction Research, 12*, 2-11.
- Callan, V., & Jackson, D. (1985). Children of alcohol fathers and recovered alcoholic fathers: Personal and family functioning. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 47*, 180-182.
- Cloud, W., & Granfield, W. (2009). Conceptualising recovery capital: Expansion of a theoretical construct. *Substance Use and Misuse, 43*, 1971-1986.
- Day, E., Gaston, R., Furlong, E., Murali, V., & Coppello, A. (2005). United Kingdom substance misuse treatment workers' attitudes toward 12-step self-help groups. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 29*, 321-327.
- De Leon, G. (2000). *The therapeutic community: Theory, model and method*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Dubieli, R. (2004). *The road to fellowship: The role of the Emmanuel Movement and the Jacoby Club in the development of Alcoholics Anonymous*. New York: Universe, Inc.
- Eley, S., Malloch, M., McIvor, G., Yates, R., & Brown, A. (2002). *Glasgow's pilot drug court in action: The first six months*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Social Research.
- Eley-Morris, S., Gallop, K., McIvor, G., Morgan, K., & Yates, R. (2002). *Drug treatment and testing orders: Evaluation of the Scottish pilots*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Social Research.
- Ellis, A., & Harper, R. A. (1975). *A new guide to rational living*. Oxford: Prentice-Hall.
- Engel, G. L. (1980). The clinical application of the biopsychosocial model. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 137*, 535-544.
- Gilman, M., & Yates, R. (2011). North-west recovery forum: Recovery and harm reduction, the odd couple of drug treatment. *Journal of Groups in Addiction and Recovery, 6*, 49-59.
- Glatt, M. (1952). Drinking habits of English middle-class alcoholics. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica, 37*, 88-113.
- Goode, E. (2007). Theories of drug use. In E. Goode (Ed.), *Drugs in American society* (7th ed., pp. 58-88). Columbus OH: McGraw-Hill.
- Goodwin, D. (1990). Evidence for a genetic factor in alcoholism. In R. Engs (Ed.), *Controversies in the addiction field* (pp. 10-16). Dubuque: Kendall Hunt.
- Hanifan, L. J. (1916). The rural school community centre. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 67*, 130-138.
- Herring, J. B. (1877). *Kenekuk, the Kickapoo Prophet*. Lawrence KS: University of Kansas Press.
- Hingson, R., Scotch, N., & Goldman, E. (1977). Impact of the Rand Report on alcoholics, treatment personnel and Boston residents. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 38*, 2065-2076.
- HM Government. (2008). *Drugs: Protecting families and communities: The 2008 drug strategy*. London: HMSO.

- Jellinek, E. (1952). Phases of alcohol addiction. *Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, *13*, 673-684.
- Jellinek, E. (1960). *The disease concept of alcoholism*. New Haven: Hillhouse Press.
- Johnson, T. V. (1986). *Malcolm X: A comprehensive annotated bibliography*. New York: Garland Publishers.
- Keller, M. (1962). The definition of alcoholism and the estimation of its prevalence. In D. Pittman & C. Snyder (Eds.), *Society, culture and drinking patterns* (pp. 310-329). New York & London: Wiley.
- Khantzian, E.J. (1974). Opiate addiction: A critique of theory and some implications for treatment. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, *28*, 59-70.
- Khantzian, E. J., Mack, J. E., & Schatzberg, J. F. (1974). Heroin use as an attempt to cope: Clinical observations. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *131*, 160-164.
- Madden, J. S. (1977). A psychiatric view of substance abuse. In J. S. Madden, R. Walker & W. H. Kenyon (Eds.), *Alcoholism and drug dependence: A multidisciplinary problem* (pp. 115-121). New York: Plenum.
- Mäkelä, K. (Ed.). (1996). *Alcoholics Anonymous as a mutual-help movement: A study in eight societies*. Geneva: World Health Organisation.
- Marlatt, A., & Gordon, J. (1985). *Relapse prevention: Maintenance strategies in the treatment of addictive behaviour*. London: Guilford Press.
- Maxwell, M. (1950). The Washingtonian movement. *Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, *11*, 410-451.
- McCarthy, K. (1984). Early alcoholism treatment: The Emmanuel Movement and Richard Peabody. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, *45*(1), 59-74.
- McIvor, G., Barnsdale, L., Eley, S., Malloch, M., Yates, R., & Brown, A. (2006). *The operation and effectiveness of the Scottish drug court pilots*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Social Research.
- Miller, W., & Rollnick, S. (1991). *Motivational interviewing: Preparing people to change addictive behaviours*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Parker, A. C. (2008). *The code of Handsome Lake, the Seneca Prophet*. Charleston SC: Forgotten Books.
- Peele, S. (1985). *The meaning of addiction: Compulsive experience and its interpretation*. Lexington: Lexington Books.
- Peele, S. (1995). *The diseasing of America*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Peele, S., & Brodsky, A. (1975). *Love and addiction*. New York: Taplinger Publishing.
- Rawlings, B., & Yates, R. (2001). Fallen Angel: An introduction. In B. Rawlings & R. Yates (Eds.), *Therapeutic communities for the treatment of drug users* (pp. 9-25). London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Roizen, R. (1987). The great controlled-drinking controversy. In M. Galanter (Ed.), *Recent developments in alcoholism* (Vol. 5., pp. 245-279). New York: Plenum Press.
- Roizen, R. (2004). How does the nation's 'alcohol problem' change from era to era? In S. Tracy & C. Acker (Eds.), *Altering American consciousness: The history of alcohol and drug use in the United States 1800-2000* (pp. 61-89). Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Room, R. (1983). Sociological aspects of the disease concept of alcoholism. In R. Smart, F. Glaser & Y. Israel (Eds.), *Alcohol and drug problems* (Vol. 7., pp. 47-91). New York and London: Plenum.
- Room, R. (2003). The cultural framing of addiction. *Janus Head*, *6*, 221-234.
- Scottish Government. (2008). *The Road to recovery: A new approach to tackling Scotland's drug problem*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Sheldon, B., & MacDonald, G. (2009). *A textbook of social work*. London: Routledge.

- Singleton, N. (2011). *Getting real about stigma in Scotland: The problem with stigmatising drug users*. London: United Kingdom Drug Policy Commission.
- Smith, D. G. (1985). Handsome Lake religion. In *Canadian Encyclopedia* (Vol. II, pp. 1121-1147). Toronto: Historica Foundation.
- Sturtevant, W., & Trigger, B. (1978). *Handbook of North American Indians: Northeast* (Vol. 15). Washington DC: Smithsonian Institute.
- Trice, H., & Wahl, J. (1958). A rank order analysis of the symptoms of alcoholism. *Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 19, 636-648.
- White, W. (2000). The history of recovered people as wounded healers: From Native America to the rise of the modern alcoholism movement. *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly*, 18, 1-23.
- White, W. (2009). *Peer based addiction recovery support: History, theory, practice and scientific evaluation*. North East Addiction Technology Transfer Centre/Great Lakes Addiction Technology Transfer Centre/Philadelphia Department of Behavioural Health & Mental Retardation Services.
- White, W., & Cloud, W. (2008). Recovery capital: A primer for addictions professionals. *Counselor*, 9, 22-27.
- White, W., & Whithers, D. (2005). Faith-based recovery: Its historical roots. *Counselor*, 6, 58-62.
- Wurmser, L. (1974). Psychoanalytic considerations of the etiology of compulsive drug use. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 22, 820-843.
- Wurmser, L. (1987). Flight from conscience: Experiences with the psychoanalytic treatment of compulsive drug abusers. *Journal of the Substance Abuse Treatment*, 4, 169-179.
- Yates, R. (1979). *Recreation or desperation*. Manchester: Lifeline Project.
- Yates, R. (1984). Addiction: An everyday disease. In J. Lishman & G. Horobin (Eds.), *Research highlights* (pp. 63-75). London: University of Aberdeen/Kogan Page.
- Yates, R. (2003). A brief moment of glory: The impact of the therapeutic community movement on drug treatment systems in the UK. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, 12, 239-243.
- Yates, R. (2012). In it for the long haul: Recovery capital, addiction theory and the inter-generational transmission of addictive behavior. In A. Adan & C. Vilanou (Eds.), *Substance abuse treatment generalities and specificities* (pp. 35-51). Barcelona: Marge-Medica Books.
- Yates, R., & Malloch, M. (2010). The road less traveled? A short history of addiction recovery. In R. Yates & M. Malloch (Eds.), *Tackling addiction: Pathways to recovery* (pp. 15-31). London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Yates, R., & McIvor, G. (2003). Alcohol and the criminal justice system in Scotland. In S. Kilcommins & I. O'Donnell (Eds.), *Alcohol, society and law* (pp. 147-178). Chichester: Barry Rose Law Publishers.
- Yates, R., McIvor, G., Eley, S., Malloch, M., & Barnsdale, L. (2005). Coercion in drug treatment: the impact on motivation, aspiration and outcome. In M. Pedersen, V. Segraeus & M. Hellman (Eds.), *Evidence Based Practice - Challenges in Substance Abuse Treatment: Proceedings of the 7th International Symposium on Substance Treatment* (pp. 159-170). Helsinki, Nordic Council for Alcohol and Drug Research/University of Aarhus/EWODOR/EFTC.
- Zinberg, N. (1984). *Drug, set and setting: The basis for controlled intoxicant use*. New Haven: Yale University Press.