

Some high-functioning ineligible consumers may oppose AOT But the research says that those who are actually in it, support it.

- Study: Of patients who were coerced into taking medication or medicated over objection in a hospital, “60 percent retrospectively agreed with having been coerced, 53 percent stating they were more likely to take medication voluntarily in the future.”¹
- Study: A study in Arizona showed that far from driving people from care, “the percentage of patients who voluntarily maintained an active relationship with community treatment centers six months after commitment increased significantly after outpatient commitment was instituted.”²
- Study: In New York, 80% of those who experienced Assisted Outpatient Treatment retroactively supported it; 75% reported that AOT helped them gain control over their lives; 81% said AOT helped them get and stay well; 90% said AOT made them more likely to keep appointments and take meds; 87% of participants said they were confident in their case manager's ability; 88% said they and their case manager agreed on what was important to work on.³
- Study: Patients who underwent mandatory treatment reported higher social functioning and slightly less stigma, rebutting claims that mandatory outpatient care is a threat to self-esteem⁴
- “Despite being under a court order to participate in treatment, current AOT recipients feel neither more positive nor more negative about their treatment experiences than comparable individuals who are not under AOT.”⁵

It is important to note, that while some claim AOT “violates” rights, it is courts that make that decision. Courts have ruled that AOT does not violate civil rights.⁶ AOT is an appropriate use of the state’s parens patriae power to help those who can’t help themselves and it’s police powers, to prevent people from harming others. No organization that claims Laura’s Law violates civil rights has ever even attempted to bring a case before the courts. For all the bluster, they likely know they will lose.

¹ Greenberg, William M., Lanna Moore-Duncan, and Rachel Herron. "Patients' Attitudes Toward Having Been Forcibly Medicated." *Bulletin of the American Academy of Psychiatry Law* 24, no. 4 (1996).

² Van Putten, Robert, Jose Santiago, and Michael R. Berren. "Involuntary Outpatient Commitment in Arizona: A Retrospective Study." *Hospital and Community Psychiatry* 39 (1998): 953-95

³ New York State Office of Mental Health. *Kendra's Law: Final Report on the Status of Assisted Outpatient Treatment*. Report to Legislature, Albany: New York State, 2005, 60.

⁴ Jo Phelan, Marilyn Sinkewicz, Dorothy Castille, Steven Huz, Bruce Link. "Effectiveness and outcomes of assisted outpatient treatment in New York State." *Psychiatric Services* 61, no. 2 (2010): 137–143.

⁵ Richard Van Dorn, Pamela Clark Robbins, Henry Steadman, Lorna Moser, Allison Gilbert, John Monahan. "Assessing outcomes for consumers in New York's assisted outpatient treatment program." *Psychiatric Services* 61, no. 10 (2010): 976–981

⁶ For a good discussion of failed attempts to have AOT classified as a violation of rights, see Appendix in Brennan, K.J. "Kendra's Law: Final Report on the Status of Assisted Outpatient Treatment." Office of Mental Health, New York State, 2005. Available at <http://mentalillnesspolicy.org/kendras-law/kendras-law-constitutional.html> (Accessed 6/2/14).